

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 247. Resolution to provide for the integrity and freedom of Formosa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, making application to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine rescinding proposal for considering a Constitutional Convention of the United States or amendments to the Constitution of the United States relating to strengthening the United Nations and Limited World Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4348. A bill for the relief of Jozef Dryja Vel Bienkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Alojzy Nieckarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4350. A bill for the relief of Albert Goldman, postmaster at New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4351. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4352. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Col. Arthur L. Shreve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Boutros Mouallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4355. A bill for the relief of Georgia Christos Demarelos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 4356. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yau Shun Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4357. A bill for the relief of Aaron Weiner and Moses Beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 4359. A bill for the relief of the estate of Lloyd L. Warfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4360. A bill for the relief of W. P. Sweetman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 4361. A bill for the relief of Chana Singer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 4362. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon a certain claim of Damaso P. Perez, and Mercedes Ruth Cobb Perez, his wife, their heirs, administrators, or assigns against the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come praying that Thou wilt refresh our souls and restore our faith as in all the bewilderment of the world's fiery strife our burdened hearts seek the quiet sanctuary of Thy healing presence. We are grateful that again we can turn unfilled to Thee with the tender grace of a new morning, fresh with the sparkling dew of Thy never-failing mercies. Thou hast called us to play our part in a day of destiny and crisis. May we not be found wanting. Forgetting the unworthy things that are behind and stretching forth to the better things that are before, as in hours of vision we see a fairer earth, let us lay aside the weight of every prejudice and the covetous sins that do so easily beset us, and regarding our high privilege as a sacred trust march on with glad and eager feet with the armies that go to free, not to bind, to develop and not to rule, to cooperate and not to dominate, until the knowledge of the Lord, who is no respecter of persons, shall cover the earth as the waters now cover the sea. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 5, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. HAYS of Arkansas had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, vice Mr. CARNAHAN, of Missouri, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Delfo Giorgi; S. 53. An act for the relief of Vittorio Quilici;

S. 155. An act for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla;

S. 223. An act for the relief of Azy Ajderian;

S. 276. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander V. Papanicolaou and his wife, Emilia;

S. 277. An act for the relief of Lily Pfannenschmidt;

S. 291. An act for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly;

S. 297. An act for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu;

S. 348. An act for the relief of Jacoba van Dorp;

S. 356. An act for the relief of Edith Winifred Henderson;

S. 363. An act for the relief of Irmgard Kohler;

S. 463. An act for the relief of Alice de Bony de Lavergne;

S. 548. An act for the relief of Freidoun Jalayer; and

S. 1092. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 178. An act for the relief of Zdenek Marek;

S. 249. An act for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife, Naima;

S. 362. An act for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu);

S. 364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter, Genevieve; and

S. 648. An act for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) authorizing certain changes in the enrollment of Senate bill 435, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Sonja Lohmann and her minor son;

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of William O. Stevens;

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Karl Chimani and Ada Chimani;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Konstantios N. Bellos;

H. R. 740. An act for the relief of John Reginald Leat;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Keady-Reich;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros;
 H. R. 1119. An act for the relief of Mario DiFilippo;
 H. R. 1581. An act for the relief of Thomas G. Fabinyl;
 H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of the Mar-den Construction Co., Inc.;
 H. R. 1691. An act for the relief of Sylvio Latino;
 H. R. 1834. An act for the relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill;
 H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison;
 H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Sanae Iida;
 H. R. 2114. An act for the relief of Joe Lee (also known as Lee Jow);
 H. R. 2170. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Maria Lummer Valentine;
 H. R. 2179. An act for the relief of Ilona Agoston;
 H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence E. Homann and her son, John A. Villas;
 H. R. 2208. An act for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter;
 H. R. 2299. An act for the relief of Biagio Poidimani;
 H. R. 2369. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Kolintza Karkalatos;
 H. R. 2406. An act for the relief of B. H. Manley;
 H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margit Helena Falk Raboff;
 H. R. 2449. An act for the relief of Jad-wiga Pulaska;
 H. R. 2455. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maryanna Boppel;
 H. R. 2538. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;
 H. R. 2771. An act for the relief of Lon Weaver;
 H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Katharina Metz;
 H. R. 3708. An act for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner;
 H. R. 3950. An act for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty;
 H. R. 4141. An act to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; and
 H. R. 4165. An act for the relief of A. D. Woods.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 5th instant,

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, reported it on June 6, 1951, and submitted a report (No. 386) thereon.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 5th instant,

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted on June 6, 1951, the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3079) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 12, after "title" in line 21, insert the following:

"Provided further, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso."

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 5th instant,

Mr. CHAVEZ also submitted on June 6, 1951, an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3709, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of the 5th instant,

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted on June 6, 1951, the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3079) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 26, after "\$250,000" in line 8, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on such terms and conditions as he determines are appropriate for the efficient operation of the combined hospital and research building, to lease for a total of not more than 99 years a portion of the present site of the National Institute of Health for the construction, operation, and maintenance thereon by the lessee of rental quarters and related facilities, such quarters and facilities to be constructed and operated without regard to local zoning limitations, but to be subject for the term of the lease to State and local taxation on the same basis as other property in the community: *Provided further*, That not more than \$50,000 of the amounts heretofore appropriated for the construction of additional auxiliary structures under this head shall be available for expenditure by the Public Health Service for the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction on the property leased pursuant to the preceding provision, such expenditure to be repaid by the lessee and credited to such appropriation."

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 5th instant,

Mr. CHAVEZ also submitted on June 6, 1951, an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3709, making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GREEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, were permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators who wish to make insertions in the Record and transact routine business may be permitted to do so now, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of April 1951, and in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MARCH-APRIL 1951, AND PAY, FEBRUARY-MARCH 1951

NOTE WITH REFERENCE TO PERSONAL SERVICE EXPENDITURE FIGURES

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of March 1951 and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of February 1951, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of April 1951 and are compared with the month of March 1951. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States. Table IV gives, by agency, the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for April 1951 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In March was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total.....	2,409,121	2,363,758	+45,363	\$693,235	\$627,555	+\$65,680
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment.....	1,226,698	1,213,684	+13,014	355,282	331,082	+24,200
2. National Military Establishment.....	1,182,423	1,150,074	+32,349	337,953	296,473	+41,480
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	2,186	2,115	+71	899	783	+116
Department of the Army.....	502,556	492,670	+9,886	133,121	119,720	+13,401
Department of the Air Force.....	239,379	229,680	+9,699	65,252	56,995	+8,257
Department of the Navy.....	438,302	425,609	+12,693	138,681	118,975	+19,706

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because payroll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES (See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States increased 42,135 from the March total of 2,198,147 to the April total of 2,240,282.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was an increase of 12,097 from the March total of 1,154,258 to the April total of 1,166,355.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for April was 1,073,927, an increase of 30,038 over the March figure of 1,043,889.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 71 from the March figure of 2,115 to the April figure of 2,186.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 9,149 from the March figure of 444,956 to the April figure of 454,105.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within the United States increased 9,096 from the March figure of 202,770 to the April figure of 211,866.

The Department of the Navy civilian personnel within the United States increased 11,722 from the March figure of 394,048 to the April figure of 405,770.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES (See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel increased 3,228 from the March total of 165,611 to the April total of 168,839.

An increase of 917 was reported by the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment from the March total of 59,426 to the April total of 60,343.

Total civilian employment outside continental United States for the National Military Establishment increased 2,311 from the March total of 106,185 to the April total of 108,496.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 737 in overseas civilian employment from the March figure of 47,714 to the April figure of 48,451.

The Department of the Air Force reported an increase of 603 in overseas civilian employment from the March figure of 26,910 to the April figure of 27,513.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 971 in overseas civilian employment from the March figure of 31,561 to the April figure of 32,532.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT (See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of April 1951 increased 16,631 from the March figure of 725,133 to the April figure of 741,764.

Industrial employment in the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment increased 266 from the March total of 25,497 to the April figure of 25,763.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 16,-

365 from the March figure of 699,636 to the April figure of 716,001.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 4,114 from the March figure of 271,654 to the April figure of 275,768. Inside continental United States, Army industrial employment increased 3,661; and outside continental United States, Army industrial employment increased 453.

The Department of the Air Force reported an increase of 4,472 from the March figure of 135,173 to the April figure of 139,645. Inside continental United States, Air Force industrial employment increased 4,066; and outside continental United States, there was an increase of 406.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 7,779 from the March figure of 292,809 to the April figure of 300,588. Inside continental United States, Navy industrial employment increased 7,011; and outside continental United States there was an increase of 768.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Table V shows personnel counted in tables I, II, III, and IV who are assigned to the mutual defense assistance program by the State Department, Economic Cooperation Administration, and the component units of the National Military Establishment, together with their pay.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the Executive agencies during April 1951, and comparison with March 1951; and pay for March 1951, and comparison with February 1951

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	February	March	Increase	Decrease	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture.....	19,128	20,845	1,717	-----	73,905	75,765	1,860	-----
Commerce ^{1,2}	17,333	19,449	2,116	-----	58,731	58,683	-----	48
Interior.....	16,608	18,150	1,542	-----	57,810	58,987	1,177	-----
Justice.....	10,484	11,714	1,230	-----	29,644	30,129	485	-----
Labor.....	2,284	2,571	287	-----	7,656	8,136	480	-----
Post Office.....	129,603	133,342	3,739	-----	497,323	501,035	3,712	-----
State.....	7,605	6,809	796	-----	26,778	27,605	827	-----
Treasury.....	27,203	30,052	2,849	-----	91,428	91,533	105	-----
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office.....	124	133	9	-----	286	282	-----	4
Bureau of the Budget.....	239	267	28	-----	527	518	-----	9
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	16	18	2	-----	73	74	1	-----
National Security Council ³	9	9	-----	-----	19	19	-----	-----
National Security Resources Board.....	153	97	56	-----	186	163	-----	23
Council of Economic Advisers.....	22	23	1	-----	46	39	-----	7
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.....	4	5	1	-----	18	18	-----	-----
Emergency agencies (1950-51):								
Defense Production Administration.....	77	149	72	-----	415	442	27	-----
Defense Transport Administration.....	41	59	18	-----	166	192	26	-----
Economic Stabilization Agency.....	856	1,378	522	-----	4,348	6,099	1,751	-----
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	138	217	79	-----	442	537	95	-----
Office of Defense Mobilization.....	20	28	8	-----	69	87	18	-----
President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.....	-----	1	1	-----	7	8	1	-----
President's Materials Policy Commission.....	5	14	9	-----	27	39	12	-----
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	11	11	-----	-----	20	26	6	-----

¹ Includes 4,020 employees of National Production Authority, an increase of 1,064 over the March figure of 2,956.

² March figure is exclusive of 2,775 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

³ Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the Executive agencies during April 1951, and comparison with March 1951; and pay for March 1951, and comparison with February 1951—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	February	March	Increase	Decrease	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	138	142	4		355	355		
Economic Cooperation Administration	1,788	1,719		69	5,239	5,314	75	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	9	9			14	15	1	
Office of the Housing Expediter	859	902	43		2,472	2,600	128	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	48	44	6		47	44		3
Philippine War Damage Commission	24	43	19		55	13		42
War Claims Commission	42	38		4	108	129	21	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	67	74	7		671	709	38	
Atomic Energy Commission	1,947	2,108	221		5,329	5,465	136	
Civil Aeronautics Board	230	243	13		544	532		12
Civil Service Commission	1,127	1,299	172		3,925	4,091	166	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	61	66	5		129	126		3
Federal Communications Commission	459	505	46		1,217	1,202		15
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	371	411	40		1,056	1,047		9
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	176	195	19		356	355		1
Federal Power Commission	285	308	23		735	732		3
Federal Security Agency ¹	9,498	10,582	1,084		35,107	35,435	328	
Federal Trade Commission	264	305	41		673	691	18	
General Accounting Office	2,208	2,418	210		6,920	6,943	23	
General Services Administration	7,096	7,664	568		28,557	29,042	485	
Government Printing Office	2,390	2,808	418		7,397	7,405	8	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,739	5,027	288		13,846	13,738		108
Indian Claims Commission	7	7			11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	786	876	90		2,144	2,189	45	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,439	2,700	261		7,630	7,619		11
National Capital Housing Authority	83	88	5		324	329	5	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	2	2			7	6		1
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	4	5	1		16	118	102	
National Gallery of Art	80	86	6		326	326		
National Labor Relations Board	521	598	77		1,576	1,529		47
National Mediation Board	55	73	18		119	117		2
National Science Foundation		2	2		19	29	10	
Panama Canal	3,222	4,147	925		20,349	20,285		63
Railroad Retirement Board	600	662	62		2,081	2,071		10
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,300	1,350	50		4,623	2,596		27
Securities and Exchange Commission	426	474	48		1,045	1,047	2	
Selective Service System	1,466	1,660	194		8,218	8,338	120	
Smithsonian Institution	162	178	16		580	610	30	
Soldiers' Home	112	112			735	735		
Tariff Commission	90	102	12		207	207		
Tax Court of the United States	61	62	1		127	127		
Tennessee Valley Authority	5,060	6,153	1,093		16,286	17,235	949	
Veterans' Administration	48,857	53,654	4,797		184,585	184,874	289	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	331,082	355,282	25,125	925	1,213,684	1,226,608	13,462	448
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			24,200				13,014	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense ²	783	899	116		2,115	2,186	71	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	109,183	121,982	12,799		444,956	454,105	9,149	
Outside continental United States	10,537	11,139	602		47,714	48,451	737	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	52,089	59,736	7,647		202,770	211,866	9,096	
Outside continental United States	4,906	5,516	610		26,910	27,513	603	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	111,697	129,990	18,293		394,048	405,770	11,722	
Outside continental United States	7,278	8,691	1,413		31,561	32,532	971	
Total, National Military Establishment	296,473	337,953	41,480		1,150,074	1,182,423	32,349	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			41,480				32,349	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	627,555	693,235	66,605	925	2,363,758	2,409,121	45,811	448
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			65,680				45,363	

¹ Revised on basis of later information.² Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.³ Includes 222 employees assigned to Munitions Board Cataloging Agency and 28 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.**TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1951, and comparison with March 1951**

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					Emergency agencies (1950-51):				
Agriculture	71,630	73,503	1,873		Defense Production Administration	415	442	27	
Commerce ¹	55,154	54,999		155	Defense Transport Administration	166	192	26	
Interior	51,456	52,227	771		Economic Stabilization Agency	4,305	6,011	1,706	
Justice	29,123	29,603	480		Federal Civil Defense Administration	442	537	95	
Labor	7,568	8,057	489		Office of Defense Mobilization	69	87	18	
Post Office	495,476	499,156	3,680		President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights	7	8	1	
State	9,787	10,290	503		President's Materials Policy Commission	27	39	12	
Treasury	90,660	90,766	106		Subversive Activities Control Board	20	26	6	
Executive Office of the President:					Postwar agencies:				
White House Office	286	282		4	Displaced Persons Commission	125	126	1	
Bureau of the Budget	527	518		9	Economic Cooperation Administration	1,300	1,320	20	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	74	1		Motor Carrier Claims Commission	14	15	1	
National Security Council ²	19	19			Office of the Housing Expediter	2,445	2,471	26	
National Security Resources Board	186	163		23	Philippine Alien Property Administration	44	5		1
Council of Economic Advisers	46	39		7	Philippine War Damage Commission	43	13		30
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	18	18			War Claims Commission	95	116	21	

¹ Includes 4,020 employees of National Production Authority, an increase of 1,064 over the March figure of 2,956.² March figure is exclusive of 2,775 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.³ Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.⁴ Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1951, and comparison with March 1951—Continued

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:					Independent agencies—Continued				
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	18	18	-----	-----	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	2,615	2,588	-----	27
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5,324	5,461	137	-----	Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,045	1,047	2	-----
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	530	518	-----	12	Selective Service System.....	7,981	8,098	117	-----
Civil Service Commission.....	3,922	4,088	166	-----	Smithsonian Institution.....	571	601	30	-----
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	129	126	-----	3	Soldiers' Home.....	735	735	-----	-----
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,191	1,177	-----	14	Tariff Commission.....	207	207	-----	-----
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,056	1,047	-----	9	Tax Court of the United States.....	127	127	-----	-----
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	356	355	-----	1	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	16,286	17,235	949	-----
Federal Power Commission.....	735	732	-----	3	Veterans' Administration.....	183,120	183,407	287	-----
Federal Security Agency.....	34,758	35,087	329	-----	Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	1,154,258	1,166,355	12,577	480
Federal Trade Commission.....	673	691	18	-----	Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment.....			12,007	
General Accounting Office.....	6,920	6,943	23	-----					
General Services Administration.....	28,484	28,969	485	-----	National Military Establishment:				
Government Printing Office.....	7,397	7,405	8	-----	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	2,115	2,186	71	-----
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13,743	13,634	-----	109	Department of the Army.....	444,956	454,105	9,149	-----
Indian Claims Commission.....	11	11	-----	-----	Department of the Air Force.....	202,770	211,866	9,096	-----
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,144	2,189	45	-----	Department of the Navy.....	394,048	405,770	11,722	-----
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	7,630	7,619	-----	11	Total, National Military Establishment.....	1,043,889	1,078,927	30,038	
National Capital Housing Authority.....	324	329	5	-----	Net increase, National Military Establishment.....			30,038	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	7	6	-----	1					
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	16	118	102	-----	Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	2,198,147	2,240,282	42,615	480
National Gallery of Art.....	326	326	-----	-----	Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....			42,135	
National Labor Relations Board.....	1,559	1,509	-----	50					
National Mediation Board.....	119	117	-----	2					
National Science Foundation.....	19	29	10	-----					
Panama Canal.....	613	613	-----	-----					
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,081	2,071	-----	10					

* Revised on basis of later information.

* Includes personnel of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1951, and comparison with March 1951

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	2,275	2,262	-----	13	Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	103	104	1	-----
Commerce.....	3,577	3,684	107	-----	National Labor Relations Board.....	17	20	3	-----
Interior.....	6,354	6,760	406	-----	Panama Canal.....	19,736	19,673	-----	63
Justice.....	521	526	5	-----	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	8	8	-----	-----
Labor.....	88	79	-----	9	Selective Service System.....	237	240	3	-----
Post Office.....	1,847	1,879	32	-----	Smithsonian Institution.....	9	9	-----	-----
State.....	16,991	17,315	324	-----	Veterans' Administration.....	1,465	1,467	2	-----
Treasury.....	768	767	-----	1	Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	59,426	60,343	1,023	106
Emergency agencies (1950-51): Economic Stabilization Agency.....	43	88	45	-----	Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment.....			917	
Postwar agencies:									
Displaced Persons Commission.....	230	229	-----	1	National Military Establishment:				
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	3,939	3,994	55	-----	Department of the Army.....	47,714	48,451	737	-----
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	27	29	2	-----	Department of the Air Force.....	26,910	27,513	603	-----
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	143	39	-----	4	Department of the Navy.....	31,561	32,532	971	-----
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	12	-----	-----	12	Total, National Military Establishment.....	106,185	108,496	2,311	
War Claims Commission.....	13	13	-----	-----	Net increase, National Military Establishment.....			2,311	
Independent agencies:									
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	653	691	38	-----	Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	165,611	168,839	3,334	106
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5	4	-----	1	Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....			3,228	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	14	14	-----	-----					
Civil Service Commission.....	3	3	-----	-----					
Federal Communications Commission.....	26	25	-----	1					
Federal Security Agency.....	349	348	-----	1					
General Services Administration.....	73	73	-----	-----					

* Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1951, and comparison with March 1951

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					National Military Establishment:				
Commerce.....	1,188	1,318	130	-----	Department of the Army:				
Interior.....	13,624	3,040	-----	584	Inside continental United States.....	244,586	248,247	3,661	-----
State.....	443	400	-----	43	Outside continental United States.....	27,068	27,521	453	-----
Treasury.....	8,982	8,909	-----	73	Department of the Air Force:				
Independent agencies:					Inside continental United States.....	115,296	119,362	4,066	-----
Atomic Energy Commission.....	129	130	1	-----	Outside continental United States.....	19,877	20,283	406	-----
General Services Administration.....	155	157	2	-----	Department of the Navy:				
Panama Canal.....	1,600	1,602	2	-----	Inside continental United States.....	268,360	275,371	7,011	-----
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	9,376	10,207	831	-----	Outside continental United States.....	24,449	25,217	768	-----
Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	25,497	25,763	966	700	Total, National Military Establishment.....	699,636	716,001	16,365	
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment.....			266		Net increase, National Military Establishment.....			16,365	
					Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	725,133	741,764	17,331	700
					Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....			16,631	

* Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Federal employees assigned to mutual-defense assistance program

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In February was—	In March was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In March numbered	In April numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total.....	\$7,949	\$8,604	+\$655	\$29,008	\$26,017	-\$2,991
State Department.....	110	115	+5	237	242	+5
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	8	4	-4	15	8	-7
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	17	20	+3	44	46	+2
Department of the Army.....	6,579	7,030	+451	24,505	21,668	-2,837
Department of the Air Force.....	411	407	-4	1,173	1,195	+22
Department of the Navy.....	824	1,028	+204	3,034	2,858	-176

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Latest monthly figures available today indicate the cost of the Federal civilian payroll in the executive branch has now equalled, and probably exceeded, the \$8,300,000,000 annual rate of the World War II peak.

The 70 reporting agencies certified the payroll for the month of March alone totaled \$693,235,000. On a 12-month basis this would amount to \$8,300,000,000. In the same reports the agencies showed that the number of persons employed continued to increase in April at the rate of 1,500 a day.

There is a month's lag between the personnel count and the actual payroll cost figures. In March when the cost reached the annual rate of the World War II peak, the number of civilians employed was approximately 70 percent of the employment average of 3,500,000 in the peak war year. Federal pay raises since 1945 are the principal factor in the accelerated cost.

Total civilian employment in the executive branch in March totaled 2,363,758. The net increase in April was 45,363, bringing the total to 2,409,121.

Civilian employment by the Military Establishment increased by 32,349 during the 30 days of April, bringing the total to 1,182,423. It was the tenth consecutive month when civilian employment by the Army, Navy, and Air Force increased at an average of more than 1,000 per day. The increase was equally divided between white collar and industrial employees.

Employment by civilian agencies in April totaled 1,226,698. The increase for the month was 13,014, including 3,712 by the Post Office Department, 1,761 by the Economic Stabilization Agency and 1,064 by the National Production Authority. In addition there were substantial seasonal increases in the Agriculture and Interior Departments.

These figures have been developed in connection with employment reports for the month of April submitted by the various agencies of the Government to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1600. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Scialba; and

S. 1601. A bill for the relief of Ciriaco Catino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1602. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1603. A bill to assure allocations for freight cars and locomotives; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1604. A bill for the relief of Truman W. McCullough;

S. 1605. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Monchen; and

S. 1606. A bill for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1607. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for payment of claims of evaders and those who escaped from prisoner of war camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1608. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 151), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to have printed for its use 25,000 copies of part 1 of Senate Report No. 359, Eighty-second Congress, a Report on Health Insurance Plans in the United States.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 598. An act for the relief of Sonja Lohmann and her minor son;

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Karl Chimani and Ada Chimani;

H. R. 732. An act for the relief of Konstantinos N. Bellos;

H. R. 740. An act for the relief of John Reginald Leat;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gizella Keady-Reich;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Sageros;

H. R. 1119. An act for the relief of Mario DiFilippo;

H. R. 1581. An act for the relief of Thomas G. Fabinyi;

H. R. 1585. An act for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1691. An act for the relief of Sylvio Latino;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Sanae Iida;

H. R. 2114. An act for the relief of Joe Lee (also known as Lee Jow);

H. R. 2170. An act for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Maria Lummer Valentine;

H. R. 2179. An act for the relief of Ilona Agoston;

H. R. 2180. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florence E. Homann and her son, John A. Villas;

H. R. 2208. An act for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter;

H. R. 2299. An act for the relief of Biagio Poidimani;

H. R. 2369. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Kolintza Karkalatos;

H. R. 2406. An act for the relief of B. H. Manley;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margit Helena Falk Raboff;

H. R. 2449. An act for the relief of Jadwiga Pulaska;

H. R. 2455. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maryanna Boppel;

H. R. 2538. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 2771. An act for the relief of Lon Weaver;

H. R. 3665. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Katharina Metz;

H. R. 3708. An act for the relief of Mrs. Goldie Weiner;

H. R. 3950. An act for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; and

H. R. 4165. An act for the relief of A. D. Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of William O. Stevens; and

H. R. 1834. An act for the relief of Florence Grace Pond Whitehill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann Morrison; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4141. An act to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address on the relation between the world struggle and the necessary struggle against inflation on the home front, delivered by him before the national convention of the American Federation of Musicians, in the Hotel Commodore, New York City, June 6, 1951.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Excerpts from Memorial Day address by Herve J. L'Heureux at Freeport, Long Island, May 30, 1951, and article entitled "Prayers for Peace Vital Now," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of May 30, 1951.

By Mr. BYRD:

Memorial Day sermon by Rev. J. Clyde Mohler, pastor of the Berryville Presbyterian Church, in Green Hill Cemetery, Berryville, Va., May 27, 1951.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Correspondence between him and Chester Bowles, former OPA Administrator, regarding methods for meeting the threat of inflation.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Excerpt from address regarding the proposed televising of congressional hearings, delivered by Dean Alfange at testimonial dinner tendered to Mayor Impellitteri, of New York.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Article by Louis Bromfield and editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of June 3, 1951, regarding the program of the Office of Price Stabilization.

Telegram from Ed Stalp, of West Point, Nebr., relating to the meat-price program of the Office of Price Stabilization.

By Mr. NEELY:

Articles entitled "Illusions and Realities in World Affairs" and "Who Should Distrust Whom?" published in the February-March 1951 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III.

By Mr. HUNT:

Letter from Robert E. Burns, secretary-treasurer of Local No. 769, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, of Cheyenne, Wyo., regarding salaries of postal employees.

By Mr. GEORGE:

Editorial entitled "The Acheson Bombshell," from the June 2, 1951, issue of the Albany (Ga.) Herald, dealing with the State Department paper on Formosa.

Editorial by H. T. McIntosh in the May 30, 1951, issue of the Albany (Ga.) Herald, dealing with the war in Korea.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Article entitled "Serge Koussevitzky Succumbs at 76," published in the Boston Herald of June 5, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Koussevitzky," published in the Washington Post of June 5, 1951.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A letter dated June 3, 1951, addressed to him by Malcolm McMurchie, of Centerville, S. Dak., and article from the Drovers' Journal of May 9, 1951, dealing with Government control of the prices of livestock.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "United States Information Program Praised by Yale Official," published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 28, 1951.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Letter No. 210, dated June 1, 1951, published in Counter-Attack, dealing with Communist activities.

By Mr. KERR:

Editorials entitled "The MacArthur Testimony," from the May 8 and May 9 issues of the Charlotte (N. C.) News.

Editorial entitled "Dewey's Challenge to His Party," from the May 14, 1951, issue of the Charlotte (N. C.) News, dealing with Governor Dewey's program for a foreign policy.

THE KEM AMENDMENT ON STRATEGIC MATERIALS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to place a news dispatch in the RECORD, and comment upon it for 3 or 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, an Associated Press dispatch of this morning reveals that the Truman administration is planning drastic action next week to delay enforcement of a new congressional order denying economic aid to countries which sell war-potential goods to Russia or its satellites.

The dispatch says:

President Truman is expected to make a temporary, virtual blanket exception to the ban, pending efforts of his advisers to figure out exactly what it means and, meanwhile, to try to persuade Congress to modify it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete Associated Press

dispatch be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID

(By John M. Hightower)

WASHINGTON, June 7.—The Truman administration is planning drastic action next week to delay enforcement of a new congressional order denying economic aid to countries which sell war-potential goods to Russia or its satellites.

President Truman is expected to make a temporary, virtual blanket exception to the ban, pending efforts of his advisers to figure out exactly what it means and, meanwhile, to try to persuade Congress to modify it.

Administration officials said if the order was applied literally it would wreck this Nation's foreign economic assistance programs and disrupt the drive to strengthen friendly nations against Communist aggression.

Since last Saturday, when Mr. Truman signed an appropriation bill containing the ban, foreign governments have bombarded the State Department with inquiries as to how they would be affected. It is understood they are being told that detailed application of the new legal requirement is still being studied.

Mr. Truman originally considered vetoing the bill but signed it because of the \$365,000,000 in urgently needed funds it carried. At the same time he issued a statement protesting the trade ban as threatening a "death blow at the tremendous defense effort in which the free nations are now engaged."

Under this law economic aid would be forbidden to all countries which ship to Russia or its satellites (1) military equipment, (2) goods which may be used in the manufacture of military equipment, and (3) any article which the United States refuses to ship to the Communist bloc.

Application of these prohibitions has fallen primarily to the State, Defense, and Commerce Departments and the Economic Cooperation Administration. Secretary of Defense Marshall is understood to have prepared a list of hundreds of items which fall within the prohibitions. ECA is due to announce the list today.

Administration officials said that even a very narrow interpretation of the order would hit virtually all the countries receiving economic aid.

Provision for exceptions is made in the law when they are considered by the National Security Council to be in the interest of American security. Mr. Truman is Chairman of the Council, which includes Secretaries Acheson and Marshall.

Exceptions across the board will stretch the power of exemption to the utmost since it evidently was intended by Congress to be used mainly in special and unusual circumstances. But the administration will take the position that any other action would be contrary to America's security interests because it would weaken friendly nations which the United States has been trying for several years to strengthen.

Congress allowed only 15 days to put the trade ban into effect. Since almost half this time has now elapsed and a detailed list of banned items has just been completed, officials said, there is not enough time remaining to comply with all the provisions of the ban. Therefore action must be taken next week at the latest to gain time to clear up the situation.

The new ban would cut off virtually all exports from the non-Communist countries to Russia. It makes no allowance for badly needed imports such as timber, coal, and food which the countries of Western Europe get from behind the Iron curtain.

Also State Department officials say there is room for honest difference of opinion between

the United States and its allies over what will be of strategic benefit to Russia and what will not. The European countries now ban shipment to the Soviet bloc of about 90 percent of the manufactures and materials which the United States embargoes. However, that 10 percent of difference would be sufficient to cause many European nations to lose American economic aid under a strict application of the new law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly upon the dispatch. After the Senate once again has taken mandatory action in blocking shipment of strategic materials which are being used by Red China to kill our boys, it is not surprising that the new law denying United States aid to countries that ship war materials to Communist China and other Soviet bloc countries is disturbing the Truman-Acheson administration.

For years they have been fumbling with this glaring inconsistency, offering nothing but excuses and promises to do something to stop this damnable traffic.

The original Marshall plan act passed in 1948 gave the administrators discretionary authority to deny economic assistance to countries that help the Soviet block arm to the teeth. But the flow of strategic materials to the Soviet bloc continued. Every subsequent attempt in Congress to make it mandatory upon the administration to do something met opposition from the administration.

The Kem amendment to the third supplemental appropriation bill, which was passed only last week, is an effort to spell out definite, mandatory procedure from which there can be no escape by the administration short of nullification of the law.

The United States has prohibited many commodities—note this, Mr. President—the United States has prohibited many commodities from being exported from this country to the Soviet bloc, because such commodities would be helpful to the Communists in arming. The Kem amendment requires that the Secretary of Defense certify this list to the Foreign Aid Administrator and he must stop giving aid to countries that permit identical articles to be exported by their nationals to the Soviet bloc.

That is all the Kem amendment does. We want recipients of ECA funds to deal with the exportation of strategic materials in the same manner as they are dealt with by our Government; that the same restrictions should apply to them that apply to our own industry in this country. The Kem amendment simply extends to ECA countries the rule that applies to our own country.

Countries receiving economic or financial aid from the United States must certify monthly that they are not permitting such exports. The National Security Council is authorized to make exceptions in cases or items when the security of the United States is involved, but these exceptions must be reported as they are made to congressional committees.

Propaganda emanating from the appeasers in the State Department that the Kem amendment is designed to stop all trade between the free world and the Soviet bloc is grossly misleading.

The American people are justifiably indignant over the flow of strategic materials to Communist China and other countries in the Soviet bloc from countries that profess to be our allies, countries that are feeding upon the toil and sweat of American taxpayers.

Our people are righteously indignant over the shipment of war materials to Red China to be used in killing and wounding our boys in Korea. And our people are demanding that the Truman-Acheson administration stop its quibbling and use the lever of United States economic and financial assistance to bring countries in the free world to a recognition of the fact there is a war in Korea and that we do not intend to help them help the enemy.

The American people are making heavy sacrifices in men engaged in the war in Korea and in arming and supporting the free world in preparedness against a possible world war. Let those countries receiving aid from the United States show their sincerity by certifying to the United States that they are not aiding the enemy by furnishing him those things that the Secretary of Defense declares would aid him. That is all the amendment asks be done.

If the President nullifies the law by granting a universal exception to its provisions, he will have to answer to his own conscience and to an aroused public opinion. Congress, representing the people, has done its duty in passing the law. It is now up to the Truman-Acheson administration to enforce it and not throw out numerous misleading excuses.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for allotting me time to make these brief observations concerning the Associated Press dispatch which came over the ticker this morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not have any time to yield to the Senator from Delaware, unless it is granted by unanimous consent. We are now acting under a unanimous-consent agreement for the transaction of routine business, without debate.

STABILIZATION OF PRICES AND WAGES— CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR MOODY AND BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, Congress will shortly face a decision which will in my judgment go far toward determining the sort of country we shall live in the future. What we do will be instrumental in deciding whether we can hold our economy together, as we make ourselves so strong that it would be suicide for an aggressor to attack us, or whether the emergency, and the vast shift of production from civilian to military goods will be permitted to undermine our economy from within through inflation, and thus play into the hands of the Red imperialists whose purpose it is to destroy us.

I refer to our decision as to whether the National Production Act, which will expire June 30, is to be renewed and strengthened, or whether we are to accept the advice of those who would now have us rip the steering wheel from our

economy and permit it to careen to wreckage.

None of us like controls. But we cannot permit the consequences of a ruinous spiral of prices and wages which removal of the stabilization would bring. Therefore, to supplement the material being gathered by the Banking and Currency Committee in its hearings now in progress, I addressed a letter to Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, asking him four specific questions.

I believe experience has shown Mr. Baruch's economic judgment to be exceptionally good, indeed perhaps the best in the country in such national emergencies as we are now in. I presented his letter to the committee this morning, and now request unanimous consent that his letter, and my inquiry, be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 4, 1951.

Mr. BERNARD M. BARUCH,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR Mr. BARUCH: The Senate Banking and Currency Committee, as you know, is currently holding hearings looking to the renewal and amendment of the National Production Act before its expiration June 30.

I believe Congress and the country should have the benefit of your views on this issue, as a man of repeatedly proved wisdom and foresight, especially in this field.

In my judgment, the American people want no controls over their lives or their country which are not imperatively necessary.

On the other hand, I feel that at a time when world peace and our survival is threatened by aggressive revolutionary communism—and when our freedoms may well depend on our making ourselves as militarily strong as possible as quickly as possible—our people want and expect their Congress and their Government to take any steps necessary to protect our system from a serious inflation, which could play into Stalin's hands by destroying our economy from within.

In this emergency, a great proportion of our national production must of course be devoted to making military weapons. It is proposed that by next autumn we will be turning out the hardware of war at a rate of \$50,000,000,000 a year. Until we can increase our productive capacity to a point where our military strength will make it clearly suicide for an aggressor to attack us, and at the same time provide civilian markets with a full supply of goods, relative scarcities will make likely a highly dangerous deterioration in the value of the dollar unless adequate measures are taken.

In two World Wars and at the inception of the present emergency, you have spelled out the dangers of such inflation, and proposed measures to protect the Nation against it, with great clarity and firmness.

I know it would have interested you, therefore, had you heard witness after witness representing great interests in the Nation with much to lose should a destructive price-wage spiral burn out the system within which they operate, come before our committee and urge either elimination of price and wage controls entirely or exemption of their own interest from such regulation.

In an industrial and agricultural complex such as ours, it is of course imperative that such controls as are imposed be administered well and equitably. Since it is Congress' responsibility to enact a law under

which this would be possible, I hope that you will give me your judgment on the following:

1. If price, wage, rent, and other direct controls should be removed at this time, as has been proposed, what would be the effect (a) on our program to increase our military strength, (b) on the stability and soundness of our economic system, (c) on the cost to the taxpayers of our mobilization program and (d) on the living standards of the American family?

2. Do you believe it practical to grant favored exemptions such as have been requested for certain industries or segments of the economy?

3. Do you believe that the greatest danger of inflation is behind us or ahead of us?

4. Do you believe that we may safely avoid this issue, or that our freedoms and our survival may be involved in meeting it squarely?

Any guidance you can give me on this important question I will appreciate. I hope you will not object to my giving the committee and Congress the benefit of your conclusions.

Cordially and respectfully yours,
BLAIR MOODY,
United States Senator.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 6, 1951.

HON. BLAIR MOODY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter just received asking my views on the renewal of the National Production Act now under consideration by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

The issue before your committee—and the Nation—is a simple one. It is a question of which is to be put first—the national interest or the selfish interest.

It is not a question of how little in the way of economic controls we can stagger along with, but of how much are we willing to give up in defense of our liberties.

Through ruthless exactions imposed on their own people, as well as upon the enslaved satellites, the Soviets have built a military power which today threatens the peace of the world. If the free peoples of the world cannot match these exactions and build an effective defense in time, they will have forfeited the right to remain free.

To answer the specific questions raised in your letter:

1. The removal of price, wage, rent, and other mobilization controls would be a tragic, perhaps mortal blow to our efforts to rebuild our defenses in time to avert another world war; the stability and soundness of our economic system would be sapped, and the long-range effects might even be worse than the immediate ones; the cost to the people in higher taxes would be doubled and tripled—already price rises have cut every defense dollar by more than one-fifth. Although in the process some would profiteer, the living standards of millions would be severely lowered.

2. No, absolutely no. There should be no exemption or favoritism for any group. To stop inflation, all wages, all prices, all rents, all costs—the whole economy—must be stabilized. Within this general frame of stabilization, some increases can be permitted where necessary for defense and to eliminate inequities. But the first rule must be—bring all under the law, with special privilege to none. With such a new law must go more courageous administration.

3. Whether the greatest danger of inflation is behind or ahead depends on the law the Congress enacts and the courage with which it is administered. The constant nibbling of rising prices can be stopped through prompt, effective action. This requires not only price, wage, and rent control but the vigorous use of the priority power to insure that first things come first

through the entire economy; much heavier taxation; an end to all unnecessary spending; screen all proposed issues of new securities to put off what can be postponed. Let us make sure that all grants and loans to other countries are weighed in terms of the material resources involved and not simply release more money which encourages other nations to drive up prices in competition for limited quantities of raw materials.

4. There is no avoiding the issue. Until the gap between Soviet armament and our defenses is bridged there can be no basis for peace. The longer our mobilization drags, the greater the ultimate effort and cost which will have to be borne.

We should be able to relax controls once we have balanced Russia's rearmament.

Neglect and procrastination have aggravated the problem. When the Korean fighting began, prompt action should have been taken to bring the economy under control and to avert the profiteering and speculation which were bound to come. The experience of the last two wars showed this was what had to be done, and, as you know, I urged it upon your committee. Instead, the economy was allowed to run wild. Ever since, there has been a frantic scramble to recover the equilibrium that should never have been lost.

Those who seek exemption for their own profits do not serve their own true interests. What will it gain the farmer or worker or businessman to get a little more for his production, if that is offset by rising prices and by the cheapening of all savings in every form—life insurance, Government bonds, thrift accounts, annuities, pensions.

Those savings represent past earnings with which millions of people expect to finance their retirement as they grow old, to help put their children through school, to care for their loved ones after they are gone, to buy a home. Slash the purchasing power of those savings through inflation and millions will be robbed of their means of independence. They will be forced to turn to the state.

It is because I am so opposed to Government controls in peacetime that I feel so strongly the need for the controls now. To fail to stop inflation is to invite perpetual regimentation in the future.

Already no city or State can plan even for the immediate years ahead. How much will the taxes collected be worth and by how much more will expenses have risen? Already our educational institutions are struggling to survive in the face of shrinking endowment funds. Hospitals and charitable institutions will have to close or curtail their services; every form of voluntary insurance against sickness and accident will have to be refinanced and higher rates charged.

Millions of persons on fixed incomes—policemen, firemen, teachers, nurses, civil servants, and others—are being ground between rising prices and rising taxes. What is to be their future if prices are allowed to run wild?

I could go on for pages showing how inflation strikes at everything Americans hold dear, at all our social and personal values, at all our families and institutions. Nor is it surprising that it should be so. For the test of our ability to stop inflation is the test of our ability to govern ourselves. It is the test of what we prize most highly—petty profits and trivial comforts, or freedom.

It is the test of whether we are a Nation united in awareness of common interests or whether we are a mere aggregation of pressure groups divided in a scramble for selfish gain.

It is the test of our fitness to survive.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

P. S.—You know well enough what to do, damn the political torpedoes, go ahead.

B.

AFFIRMATION OF FRIENDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FOR ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, which were to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Congress of the United States reaffirms the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, and declares—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people believe the Soviet Government could advance the cause of peace immeasurably by removing those artificial barriers, thus permitting the free exchange of information between our peoples; and

That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to resolve the differences standing between the United States Government and the Soviet Government and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor; and

That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

And to amend the preamble by inserting after the third paragraph thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

Whereas the Congress reaffirms its policy as expressed in law "to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion"; and

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. McMAHON, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3709.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agen-

cies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is the so-called Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. I am in total sympathy with the plan to take up the appropriation bill. I am in total sympathy with the idea of proceeding right along with the Senate program, as the majority leader well knows. However, I wish to point out to him, and also to the Senator in charge of the bill, the very gracious Senator and respected Senator from the great State of New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I like the Senator from Nebraska, too.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

It has come to my attention that certain Senators are very anxious to obtain statistics and facts from various agencies relative to the application of the so-called Jensen amendment, which the House adopted, and which will be in conference, as well as the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], which approaches the question of stabilization of employment in another fashion, namely, by a 5-percent cut in appropriations for salaries.

I am wondering if the distinguished majority leader would not heed the pleas of Senators who have talked with me this morning. Perhaps we could proceed with this bill, or with some other bill, until Senators have an opportunity to obtain the statistics and facts which they desire. If that is not feasible, would the Senator include in his motion a stipulation—if that is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill—that Senators be given time to prepare themselves to discuss the controversial amendments, so that they may be threshed out on the floor of the Senate?

The Independent Offices appropriation bill is being marked up this afternoon by the full Committee on Appropriations. I understand that the Jensen amendment is also included in that bill, although I am not a member of the subcommittee having it in charge. It seems to me that in all the appropriation bills in which the Jensen amendment is involved, the application should be the same, so far as possible, as in connection with the Labor-Federal Security bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It will possibly be the general pattern.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I wish to cooperate fully with the distinguished majority leader in expediting the work of the Senate. With that in mind, I wonder if the Senator in charge of the bill can give assurance that Senators who are interested in controversial amendments will have an opportunity to present their views. In the meantime, we might proceed with the bill and agree to the amendments which are not controversial. If it is desired to pass over an amendment temporarily, it could be held up until later this afternoon, or preferably until tomorrow, if that is agreeable. That would give Senators an opportunity

this afternoon and tonight to prepare themselves to discuss both the Jensen amendment and the so-called Cordon amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am in complete sympathy with the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. I wish to cooperate with Senators, so that every Member of the Senate may understand the provisions of the bill.

In my opinion, the only controversial matter which will arise in connection with this bill will be the so-called Jensen amendment, or the substitute for it proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. Aside from that, with respect to the so-called money items, after I make the explanation as to those items I do not believe there will be any controversy.

Inasmuch as I wish to cooperate with the Senator from Nebraska, and inasmuch as I feel that the Senate would like to proceed with its work, I should like to have the Senate at least act on the money items and get them out of the way. We are now about 6 weeks behind with appropriation bills.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] have contacted my office and have asked for a little more time. I informed them, after talking with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that he would be willing to take up the bill and dispose of the noncontroversial matters, and that he would be willing to pass over until tomorrow any items which they wanted to have passed over.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have been assigned to the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, which has had this bill under consideration. However, I did not have an opportunity to sit in any of the hearings. Before the bill was reported, I asked whether any Senator interested in economy had offered any suggestions to the subcommittee or the full committee as to how greater economy could be effected than the economy for which the subcommittee had voted. I was informed that no such suggestion had been offered. I therefore assumed that no Member of the Senate was planning to raise any serious objection.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not speak to the question raised by the Senator from Virginia. However, I believe that several amendments were offered to effect economies, and there was considerable debate as to the best way to do it—either through the Jensen amendment or the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. In the event we should have an understanding, and certain amendments were agreed to—I wish the Senator from Illinois would listen to

this. It may involve what he is interested in.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I always listen to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Now I will proceed.

Let us assume that all noncontroversial amendments in the bill are agreed to. Then we will come to the final amendment proposing to reduce the appropriation, or possibly the Senator from Illinois will offer such amendments as we proceed with the bill. If we wait until near the conclusion of the consideration of the bill before taking up the proposal for a reduction, it should be thoroughly understood that, although we may approve certain amendments as we go along, when the final amendment, providing for a reduction, is acted on it should apply to the amendments already adopted. If there is to be a blanket cut, it cannot be handled otherwise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator from Nebraska referring now to the blanket cut of 5 percent proposed by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as salaries are concerned, the 5-percent cut would apply to each individual item in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I make. Inasmuch as that is true, I want it thoroughly understood that if we should proceed with the consideration of the bill under the theory that noncontroversial amendments would be agreed to, even though an amendment might not be controversial at the moment, at the conclusion, so far as concerns a blanket amendment, such an amendment, even though it affected all the amendments previously agreed to, would not be foreclosed merely because we had previously adopted certain other amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct. Any amendments which we might possibly agree to at this time would not foreclose the 5-percent amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for making that clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his graciousness in this matter. I appreciate the pressure under which the committee has been operating, the work which it has done, and the many perplexing problems which it has faced. However, I should like to indicate the position in which other Members of the Senate are placed by the late reporting of this measure and its almost immediate consideration after the bill has been reported. It was not until 10 o'clock this morning that I was able to obtain a copy of the bill. It was not until 11:15 that I was able to obtain a copy of the report. I believe this is the first time that the hearings have been before the Senate in printed form.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the hearings have been available for some time. However, inasmuch as the bill was delayed for one whole week, until yesterday, because of the so-called Jensen amendment, it was impossible to prepare the final report and to report the bill until today. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that it is not giving Members of the Senate a great deal of time in which to study the measure. It is a measure which calls for appropriations of approximately two and a half billion dollars, even though the major portion of that amount is allocated to the States, and is more or less obligatory.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the last hour I have been preparing a series of amendments which I intend to offer to the bill. It has been work done under some pressure. I should like to suggest that we go through the bill, with the understanding that approval of committee amendments will not be final, but that if objections are subsequently raised to committee amendments that they may be reconsidered. I make the request because under the ordinary parliamentary procedure once a committee amendment is approved there is no possibility of subsequent reconsideration. Therefore, I would not like to have it understood that committee amendments would be approved in advance without possibility of reconsideration.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like first to answer the Senator from Illinois. I believe there is some reason and justification for the request of the Senator from Illinois. However, I believe he should allow me to proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to proceed to make explanation of the committee's position and decision on the subject matter. If, following such explanation, he wishes to make his request I shall be very glad to consider it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to point out to the Senator from Illinois that I, too, am very much interested in economy. I am as much interested in economy as he is. I wish to say also that he has known for more than a month what is contained in the House bill. If he felt the House bill contained appropriations which he considered were too high, he had sufficient time in which to make suggestions in that regard to the subcommittee.

The subcommittee has cut the House appropriations by more than \$100,000,000. Many of the cuts affect hospital work and activities which are of very tender concern to a good many Members of the Senate. The subcommittee felt that, outside of the salaries, it had cut all that it could afford to cut. Otherwise, I would have voted for more cuts.

In this morning's Washington Post I read an article by a prominent commentator in which he intimated that the Democrats had not done so well by taking the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] off the Appropriations Committee and putting me on the committee in his place, because I gave my proxy to a Republican member, who voted for economy, which is what a Republican member of the committee would have

done. Mr. President, each year we celebrate Jefferson-Jackson Day. If anyone knows anything about Jefferson and Jackson he must know that economy was one of the fundamental principles for which they stood. I do not object to being called a Republican, if being for economy puts me in that category.

I should like to ask what we would accomplish if we considered a committee amendment and acted on it with the understanding that we were only going through the motion of adopting it and could go back and take it up again at a later date. I think that we should conclude our consideration of the amendments in which we have already cut \$100,000,000, but that we should leave for final vote until tomorrow the question of whether or not we shall adopt the Cordon amendment, calling for a 5-percent cut of all salaries, which would amount to a saving of something over \$2,000,000, or whether we should adopt the Ferguson proposal, making a cut of 10 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator will not press for a final vote on the bill today and will not proceed in any manner which would cut off consideration of amendments to the bill. The Senator from Michigan feels that the amount of the appropriations in the bill is too high.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Michigan has been telling us that for the last 2 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and I must insist on it on the floor. I believe that the cost of Government is too high. We must cut it. We tried to do so in committee. In the opinion of the senior Senator from Michigan, we have not been very successful. I hope we will be given an opportunity to be more successful on the floor.

The work of the Committee on Appropriations is very exacting. It is hard work. It takes all of the time of the Senators who sit on the committee. The Senator from Michigan was unable to do anything on the bill this morning because he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, sitting in the Caucus Room, and listened to military authorities explain that their appropriations will run to about \$60,000,000,000. They also indicated that there would be requests for supplemental and deficiency appropriations over and above that amount. Therefore, today, we are facing one of the greatest tasks of government, which is deciding on the amount of money that should be appropriated. There is no doubt whatever that the cost of government has increased over and above the aggregate of the Government's income. It therefore behooves every Member of the Senate to do everything he can to see to it that we make proper appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course neither the Senator from New Mexico nor any other Senator can pro-

hibit or prevent the Senator from Michigan from offering amendments to the recommendations which have been made by the Committee on Appropriations. It is not the purpose of the Senator from New Mexico, who is handling the bill on the floor, to prevent any Senator from offering any amendment he may desire to offer.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we go through the items in the bill and agree to them in the absence of amendments which some Senators desire to offer to such items, we shall be prevented later from offering such amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is all very well to talk about economy. However, we must be reasonable about this so-called economy. If we really mean what we say we can carry it to extremes. In this body there is a great deal of loose talk and discussion of subjects which do not involve either the Government or economy, and there is more money being wasted on such discussions than could be saved by amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish Senators would take it seriously and not waste so much of the taxpayers' money in a discussion of matters that do not effect any savings whatever. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I resent the Senator's indicating that discussions on the floor of the Senate involve the expenditure of more money than could be saved on an appropriation bill involving more than \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so, but if the Senator from Michigan had met with the committee, and possibly if he had not been more interested in finding out what was going as between Truman and MacArthur, he would understand the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan understands the bill, and he believes it should be cut.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly he does, but it happens that the majority of the members of the committee, with the exception of the Senator from Michigan, thought otherwise.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the Senator knows, I voted proxies on the cuts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Montana gave proxies to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from Montana did not attend one hearing of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that it is true that I have not attended all the meetings of the subcommittees of the

Appropriations Committee. I am on six or seven of those subcommittees, just as the Senator from New Mexico is. I gave my proxy to the Senator from Michigan because at the time when this subcommittee was holding hearings, two other subcommittees were holding hearings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to read the list of the subcommittees on which I serve.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me say that I am not even on the subcommittee which considered this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Mexico has been a Member of the Senate for a long time, and he knows that it is a physical impossibility for Senators who serve on a number of subcommittees to attend all the meetings of all of them. In my case, it is a physical impossibility for me to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Senator could have consulted the Senator from California, who has been the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and he could have consulted the Senator from Minnesota, who is just as much an economizer and is just as sincere as the rest of us are, and then the Senator would have found that the entire minority side of the subcommittee voted unanimously to report the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

I repeat that I am on a number of subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, namely, the subcommittees on Agriculture, Armed Services, District of Columbia, Interior, Independent Offices, State, Justice and Commerce, and Judiciary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the Senator that it is impossible for each Senator to attend all the meetings of all the subcommittees. For that reason I gave my proxy to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Although I did not attend all the meetings of the full committee, I attended several of them; and I believe I understand what is involved in the Jensen amendment and the so-called Cordon amendment, which is the crux of the whole matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No one is trying to rush proceedings on the Jensen amendment. The full committee decided that the cut should be 5 percent. However, if the Senate wishes to make a 7½ percent or a 10-percent or a 15-percent cut, that will be all right with me.

It is not my purpose to prevent any Senator from speaking, but I wish to have the Senate proceed in an orderly manner, and see whether we can complete action on at least a few of the items contained in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Mexico appreciates that I am not a

member of the subcommittee. However, as a member of the full committee, I attended every session when the full committee was engaged in marking up the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Mexico has agreed that although he will proceed with the committee amendments, action upon them now will not be final, and that it will be in order for amendments to be submitted to them later, in proposing alterations in the committee amendments? Do I correctly understand that is the present situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry, but is an inquiry addressed to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me suggest that we have never had any trouble in giving time to Senators who really need time in connection with appropriation bills. This bill is not as yet before the Senate for consideration. I am sure that if we make it the unfinished business and allow the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to explain the bill, then we come to the particular amendments in which Senators are interested, we shall be able to work them out; I do not think there will be any difficulty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How could any Senator prevent another Senator from offering an amendment if he desired to do so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, once the committee amendments are agreed to, they are no longer subject to amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. After the bill is made the unfinished business, when we come to pass on the individual items or amendments, if a Senator then wishes to make a reservation of the right to offer an amendment to one of those amendments, I am sure we shall not have any trouble in making such an arrangement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that my wife is leaving for Europe in about an hour, and I should like to have the privilege of seeing her off, but without closing the way to having an opportunity to present objections which I may have to individual committee amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, being a married man, too, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Illinois, and I shall carry on until he returns.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to understand the mechanics of the procedure in connection with the bill. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico is willing to have any amendment calling for a blanket cut passed over temporarily, so that we may take action on amendments which are not controversial.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator discussing the Cordon amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; but, of course, there is no such thing as a Cordon amendment which is to be offered to only one committee amendment. The Cordon amendment would apply to each salary item in the bill. For example, on page 2 of the bill, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary," there is an item, in line 13, of \$1,425,000 which was agreed to by the House; but the committee has reported an amendment to that item, reducing it by 5 percent, so that the amount would be \$1,400,000.

Mr. President, if we are in favor of the substance of the Cordon amendment and wish to support it, at least before acting on it we can talk over the various items; and at the end of that procedure, when the Jensen amendment comes up, we can go back and make a blanket cut or we can make a cut in any individual item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] offered his particular amendment and wished to make it applicable to all the salary items. There are approximately 70 such items in the bill. The committee decided that the 5-percent reduction should apply to each individual salary item, instead of being a 5-percent reduction in the total amount carried in the bill. The committee staff had quite a time figuring out what that cut would amount to in dollars and cents in the case of the 70 different items. In each case it was necessary to determine the dollars-and-cents reduction which would be made by a 5-percent cut in the items for salaries. We did not believe we should apply that cut to other items, such as expenses, which are different from salaries. The Senator from Oregon had in mind applying the cut only to salaries.

So in connection with this particular bill, we have worked in that way on 70 different items; and as we have reported the bill, it contains committee amendments which set forth the amounts of money which will be saved by applying the 5-percent reduction to the salary items.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from New Mexico agree that tomorrow any Senator can offer a motion to reduce the amount of any item contained in the bill, whether it be a salary item or any other item? If the Senator will agree to that, I think we can proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there would be no use in taking the time of the Senate today, if we were to agree to a proposition of that kind. If the Senator from Michigan wants to make a reduction of 10 percent, 15 percent, or 90 percent—as he probably would desire—the Senator from New Mexico has no objection. All the Senator from New Mexico is asking is that, after 3 months of trial, tribulations, and hard work during which a nonpartisan committee has considered this bill, its consideration be proceeded with. The report of the subcommittee was entirely unanimous,

and the Senate knows that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the ranking member on the minority side, has contributed to the effort to save money on this particular bill. If the Senate will allow me to explain exactly what has been done, not only by the subcommittee but by the full committee, it will realize that, if there is any committee which has tried to effect savings of the taxpayers' money, it is this committee. But Senators do not give us an opportunity.

If the Senator from Michigan wants to cut the appropriations contained in the bill 10 percent, why not let the Senate vote on the question and be through with it?

All I ask is that we do not waste the money of the taxpayers in futile discussion but proceed to use the time of the Senate for the remainder of the day, one way or the other. If the Senate is not satisfied with this bill, it can amend it. All I am reporting now is the action of the subcommittee, after months of hearings. All I am reporting now is the action of the full committee, after 2 weeks' consideration. All I am reporting, even on the so-called Cordon amendment, or the Jensen amendment, is the action of the full committee, after a whole week of delay in discussing that subject matter. This is the committee's action.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator think it is unreasonable for other Members of the Senate who are not on the subcommittee and who are not on the Appropriations Committee, to raise this question, in the face of a report which is not even on the desks of Senators, other than that, probably, of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I certainly have one.

Mr. FERGUSON. No other Senator has one, I think. Should not a bill involving more than \$2,000,000,000, the hearings on which number 1,232 pages lie on the desk of the Senate for longer than 1 day?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to promote consistency, as urged by my good friend from Michigan, in effecting savings for the taxpayers. The Appropriations Committee spent days and days, even months, in an effort to carry out the instructions of the Senate. We were not acting in our individual capacities; we were there acting as agents of the full committee, the members of which, in turn, were the agents of the Senate of the United States.

If we are to carry out the idea of saving money, we should be permitted to proceed, and to ascertain what the Senate thinks regarding the items of the bill. If the Senate does not like the report of the committee, and if the Senate does not like the bill, the Senate has the power and authority to amend it by way of reductions or otherwise.

Let us go a little further in the matter of saving money. Usually by this time in June the Senate has four or five or perhaps six appropriation bills out of the way. This is the first one of the 1952

appropriation bills to reach the Senate floor, and all I ask is that we be permitted to proceed. Far be it from me, as the Senator from Nebraska knows, to waste the time of the Senate. If any Senator takes but a little part of the time of this body, I submit I am that one.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If any Senator likes to please his colleagues, it is the Senator from New Mexico. If any Senator wants to be tolerant, and wants to let other Senators do anything that is within reason, it is the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But I think that further delay in connection with items which are understood and which are non-controversial would be wasting the money of the taxpayers, about which my good friend from Michigan speaks.

So far as the Cordon amendment is concerned, I have stated to the Senator from Nebraska and to the Senate that I am willing to go along and proceed with the consideration of this bill, at least as to those items which are not in controversy, and then, if we are not ready to vote on the 5-percent cut recommended by the committee, let us wait.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate gave unanimous consent that the bill might be reported when the Senate was not in session. That showed our good faith, as the Senator knows. I agree that the Senator from New Mexico is very expeditious in his work in the Senate, both as an individual and as a chairman, but why does not the Senator proceed with his statement and his report—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment—and give us the benefit of it, without our now acting upon the motion to make the bill the unfinished business of the Senate. We should like to vote tomorrow on any amendment which may be offered. I think we would accomplish much by proceeding in that way. By the time the Senator has concluded his statement, and Senators have asked their questions, this matter will probably have washed itself out.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator makes such motion—

Mr. WHERRY. I have not made it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator moves that, after the Senate agrees to the motion to make the bill the unfinished business of the Senate, I may make an explanation of the bill, I shall be glad to consider it, and I shall be glad to consider even such a request, if made, instead of a motion.

Mr. WHERRY. It would please me very much if the Senator from New Mexico would assure Members of the Senate that, if the motion made by the distinguished majority leader should be adopted, any Senator who desired to offer an amendment to the bill might do so tomorrow, and that the amendment would be voted on at that time, the Senate might proceed today to consider the bill from beginning to end. If that were done I think no time whatever would be lost.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly not. We have lost enough time.

Mr. McFARLAND rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should first like to have a vote on the motion to make the bill the unfinished business of the Senate. If that motion is agreed to, and a request of the nature suggested by the Senator from Nebraska is made thereafter, I may say to the Senator I am not at all unreasonable about such matters. But I should like to have the motion of the majority leader, that the bill be made the unfinished business of the Senate, agreed to, and then let the Senate do as it pleases. I now yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me there is really nothing in the controversy. The Senator from Nebraska urges Senators to agree that a motion to reconsider may be made tomorrow. I may say to the Senator, it is unnecessary to agree to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. McFARLAND. Such a motion could be made anyway. On any amendment which is adopted, a motion may be made to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. There is nothing in this proposal to prevent that being done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would have no objection, even to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. McFARLAND. If an amendment were adopted, and if a motion to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted should not be made in the meantime, would it not be in order tomorrow to move such reconsideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion would be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It seems to me it would be impractical to proceed along that line. It would become necessary to move to reconsider each item, in order to effect a reduction in the bill. Is it not impractical?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, I do not think it would be impractical. I do not think we would have any difficulty. We never have in such cases. When we come to the consideration of an item regarding which the Senator may want to make objection, I do not think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would object to allowing the amendment to go over until tomorrow, or would object to agreeing that a motion to reconsider could be made. But the bill has not been made the unfinished business of the Senate, and it is impossible to make an agreement until that is done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to be fair. I understood the question of the Senator from Michigan. I am not going to answer any question until we find out whether the Senate wants to continue to waste the taxpayers' money, or

whether we want to take up this bill and consider it now.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, according to one of the wisest of the 3,000 proverbs spoken by the world's wisest man, "In all labor there is profit; but the talk of the lips tendeth only to penury." For more than 5 months the Senate has, on the average, worked on this floor not more than an hour a day. During these 5 months when the Senate was in session, the talk of senatorial lips has consumed approximately 5 hours a day. In other words, we have spent 400 percent more time tending to poverty than we have spent in the production of profit. Today we have thrown away 45 precious minutes in uttering words as worthless as sounding brass and carrying on conversations as fruitless as barren trees.

Mr. President, I urge that work be forthwith substituted for words and that the Senate immediately proceed to perform its highly important legislative duties which have been far too long neglected. I give notice that during the further debate on the pending bill, I shall object to any Senator's yielding for any purpose except that of asking a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Anderson	Hendrickson	McMahon
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Brewster	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Nixon
Byrd	Jenner	O'Connor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Duff	Lehman	Stennis
Dworshak	Lodge	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thye
Eaton	Magnuson	Underwood
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Welker
Flanders	McCarran	Wherry
Frear	McCarthy	Wiley
George	McClellan	Williams
Green	McFarland	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed

a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion and ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3709; also that any Senator may have the right to offer tomorrow any percentagewise cut in the bill, and to except therefrom any item or items in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I understand also that it is the purpose of the unanimous-consent request that if tomorrow an amendment is presented to make a percentagewise cut, exceptions to the amendment may be indicated.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the observation. He has stated it as clearly as it could be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if tomorrow all amendments would be limited to a percentage cut?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not necessarily so. We may not complete consideration today of all the other amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Personally I am very much opposed to percentage cuts in appropriation bills. If we are to be limited to percentage cuts only, I shall have to object to the request.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator could present, at any time today, an amendment providing for a reduction in any item, or he could ask for an increase in an item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. Just a moment. The only object of the unanimous-consent agreement is to make sure that percentagewise amendments may be offered after the committee amendments are adopted, if it is desired to offer such amendments. Senators would have that right any way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I ask further whether the Senate would be limited, after the committee amendments are disposed of, to considering only amendments which would represent percentage cuts, rather than amendments to reduce particular items, or increase particular items?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the unanimous-consent request, it is as follows: It is intended to be used by Senators who would propose cuts greater than the commit-

tee has suggested. The proposed agreement would apply only to percentagewise cuts. However, there is nothing in the agreement which would prevent the Senator from Washington, or any other Senator, from offering an amendment changing the figures in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If that is the understanding, I will not object.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator to explain for the RECORD what he means by percentage cuts.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me explain the object of the unanimous-consent request. Technically, if a committee amendment were agreed to today, it could not be amended tomorrow by a percentagewise cut, unless the Senate reconsidered the committee amendment. The purpose of the unanimous consent agreement proposed is to get around that parliamentary situation.

Mr. AIKEN. By a percentage cut, does the Senator mean a motion made after the amount for each item is arrived at, to cut the entire bill a certain percentage across the board?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; except that it may be desired to exclude certain items from the cut.

Mr. AIKEN. I find myself very much in agreement with the Senator from Washington, that that is no way for the Senate to do business. However, like the Senator from Washington, I should like to know whether the proposed agreement would preclude any other amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, it would not preclude other amendments. As I stated before, the purpose is to get around the parliamentary situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I am referring to an amendment to cut a particular item.

Mr. McFARLAND. Such an amendment may be offered today.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the reason for postponing until tomorrow a motion for a percentage cut? Why not offer such an amendment today, and make it the regular order?

Mr. McFARLAND. The purpose is to get around the parliamentary situation which exists because of the committee amendments. If committee amendments are agreed to, in order to amend them it would be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendments are agreed to. However, certain Senators do not want to do that. They wish to make a percentagewise cut in all the items in the bill when it is ready for final consideration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I think I can explain the situation to the Senator. The bill came to us with the Jensen amendment, which is a limitation upon filling vacancies. The subcommittee spent several days on the problem, and finally the subcommittee and the full committee adopted what we call the Cordon amendment, which is a different formula from the Jensen amendment. However, it relates to personnel. It excludes hospitals, heart and cancer work, and things of that kind.

Then we had a proposal for a 10-percent cut. First it was to apply to personnel. Now we understand that it may apply to appropriations for heart and cancer work, as well as appropriations for hospitals. We certainly cannot cut the retirement funds. They are fixed by law. There is a question whether we want to cut aid to the States for medical work, and things of that kind.

The committee has cut the bill \$100,000,000 below the House figure. Some Senators wish to cut it still more. It is a very technical thing to arrange the consideration of the bill and the committee amendments in such a way that Senators may have more time. Some Senators want the vote on the major cut to go over. The Cordon amendment would make a reduction of a little more than \$2,000,000; and a 10-percent reduction would be nearly \$5,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would be more than that. It would amount to approximately \$15,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It would be more than that if it applied to hospitals. The Cordon amendment excludes hospitals and certain types of research work. It does not exclude other types of research work. We went as far as we felt we were justified in going. Therefore we hope to be able to vote today. Any Senator who wishes to increase an appropriation for an item, such as for heart, cancer, or hospital care, may do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Or cut any item.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and tomorrow it would be possible to move to reconsider any committee amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, it would be necessary to submit an amendment today in order to be able to vote on it today?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we did not do so today, we would be foreclosed from doing so tomorrow?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Tomorrow it would be necessary to move to reconsider.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. AIKEN. I join the Senator from Washington in objecting.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to add that I hope the Senate will vote to consider the bill today. We cannot force the bill through over the objection of Senators who wish to vote tomorrow. If they wish, they can talk about Acheson or the two Britishers who went behind the iron curtain. They can talk about anything they desire to talk about. It would be possible to keep the Senate from voting. Certainly we should be able to start voting today and go as far as we are able to go.

We are about to take up the first appropriation bill. It is a month late in coming to the Senate. We have 13 of 14 more appropriation bills to come before us. We cannot possibly conclude consideration of them before the end of the fiscal year. The newspapers are already criticizing the Senate for not making any progress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which considered appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency began its consideration of the bill on the 3d day of April. We held long hearings and arrived at some conclusions. The delay in making it possible for the Senate to proceed in an orderly way with regard to the bill, which is the first appropriation bill to be presented to the Senate this year, was brought about by the fact that the Senator from Michigan stated he desired to submit some amendments to cut the bill further than the committee has suggested.

I do not take my hat off to the Senator from New York or any other Senator on humanitarian matters. I do not take off my hat to the Senator from Michigan in trying to save the taxpayers' money.

In the presence of the Secretary of Labor and in the presence of representatives of the Federal Security Agency, at the start of the hearings on April 3, the chairman of the subcommittee made the following statement. I wish the Senator from Michigan, in his great desire to economize, could be here to listen to the statement. A copy of it was sent to every Senator. I said:

CAREFUL SCRUTINY OF BUDGET NECESSARY

Senator CHAVEZ. The committee, as the Secretary will understand, is confronted this year with a somewhat different problem in its consideration of budget estimates. There is the necessity to provide adequately for the defense of our country, for which we have a tentative estimate in excess of \$80,000,000,000. There is before the Congress a recommendation from the President proposing a substantial increase in taxes, which, in view of the fact that the cost of living has increased beyond salary increases, will, if enacted, result in a lowered standard of living for our citizens. It is incumbent upon the Congress then to study with infinite care these requests for public moneys. We are not faced with a Treasury surplus—rather a deficit of billions; and one way to meet a deficit is to reduce expenditures.

The record will show that this subcommittee, our Committee on Appropriations and the Senate and the Congress have all supported the programs of the Department of Labor, of the Federal Security Agency, and of the related independent agencies. We have through the years allowed substantially what was requested. At this point though it seems that the estimates as a whole, from each and every constituent agency, must be reduced in the interest of Government solvency. Some programs which admittedly are providing worth while and necessary services may have to be cut back—just as we are calling upon the individual citizen to get by on less this year than he had last year.

We proposed to afford to the representatives of each constituent agency an adequate opportunity to justify and explain fully their requests for funds. I wish the fiscal position of our Government were such that we could allow the estimates in their entirety. But the millennium has not yet arrived so we must be governed accordingly.

DEVIATIONS FROM PURPOSES OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

Over the past few years there has been a movement underway to merge appropriation accounts; to remove limitations, and prescriptions with reference to the use of funds. This program was predicated on the premise

that it would enable the departments to do a better administrative job and the Congress could rely upon strict observance of the pleadings for funds as to what they would be used for.

Increasingly the committee is observing the departments and agencies after receiving the appropriations in lump sums, obligating the funds with scant attention to the details of the justifications presented to the committee and to the Congress. When questioned as to the validity of such departures from the justification details, the stock answer is that the appropriating language imposed no observance of justifications.

Moreover, the committee has found instances of fund transfers and use directly contrary to the express instructions of Congress as embodied in committee reports. And while this flagrant flaunting of congressional will may not be illegal we shall be most disappointed if ever it occurs again.

CLOSER CONTROL OF EXPENDITURES REQUESTED

If we permit this to continue, the taking of testimony is a fruitless and meaningless task in the absence of language in the bill to require observance of justifications. I call the attention of the agencies to this point and remind them that any further deviation from justifications can result in the appropriation by categories, by activities, or by object of expenditure; or the inclusion of a general provision stipulating that the funds are appropriated for the purposes and objects set out in the justifications. I propose to have a close check made in this regard on behalf of the committee throughout the coming months, and I hope that the agencies will not invite punitive action.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF REQUIREMENTS

Earlier this year I directed the staff to obtain for the committee a full and complete explanation of the proposed obligation by objects with respect to each appropriation account.

At this point let me say that when the bill came from the House, about the only question the Senate committee would investigate was whether some item which the House had cut should be restored.

I read further:

Heretofore the presentation has been an explanation merely of the increase sought by object of expenditure. That is to say, if the agency sought \$5,000 for travel, one of the objects of expenditure, which represented an increase of \$500 over the previous year's allowance, then the explanation and narrative justification dealt only with the increase—why the additional \$500 was needed—without bothering to explain the other \$4,500.

I am informed that there have been presented to the committee fairly detailed explanations of the proposed obligation of funds by object for each appropriation account. I find these explanations extremely interesting and informative, and I hope we can introduce this data into the record for the information of the committee and the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pastore in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The statement from the hearings which the Senator has been reading is very valuable and interesting to a number of Members of the Senate, but many of us wish to know whether we are going to have this bill

taken up for consideration. I understand that if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will agree that the controversial items may go over until tomorrow, for voting, there will be no objection to having the bill brought up at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask what is to be regarded as a controversial item in that connection? How will that be determined?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there is only one matter which actually is in controversy in connection with this measure, namely, the substitute for the so-called Jensen amendment. Of course there may be differences as to certain items; for instance, some Senator may believe that an item which the committee cut \$50,000,000 should have been cut \$55,000,000, or that an item which the committee increased by \$3.50 should instead be decreased \$10. However, as a matter of fact, the committee report is practically unanimous on the money items. The real controversy comes on the so-called Jensen amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am confused about the parliamentary situation. I yield to no one in my admiration for the humanitarian instincts of the Senator from New Mexico, but there are certain items in which many of us are particularly interested, notably, those concerning public health, cancer, heart disease, mental health, and research.

The report on this bill came to the Senate only a short time ago. None of us has had a chance to study the report or the bill as reported. Certainly the public is completely uninformed regarding the report. It is very possible that I may wish to submit amendments increasing some of the allowances reported by the committee. When will I be able to do so?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is nothing to prevent the Senator from submitting amendments; he can submit them now and he can change them tomorrow, as he wishes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to have an answer to this question: If I decide that I wish to submit amendments of that sort, must they be submitted and acted on this afternoon or will a reasonable time be allowed?

Mr. ROBERTSON. If I may reply, I should like to say that the amendments the Senator may submit will be acted on when we reach the items of the bill to which the amendments apply. Amendments to the committee amendments must be submitted when the particular committee amendments to which they apply are reached.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to explain the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. This bill is subject to a point of order if the bill is brought up today. I think we can save time by agreeing to let any controversial items go over until tomorrow. Such an arrangement frequently is made. In that case, any committee amendment

which a Senator wishes to have passed over, can be passed over. We shall save time by following such a procedure.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as I have stated to the Senate heretofore, generally at this time of the year there are four or five appropriation bills which have been passed by the House of Representatives and have been passed by the Senate and are in conference. However, in the present case this is the first appropriation bill for the new fiscal year which has come to the Senate. I do not wish to rush action on this bill. On the other hand, I should like to have the Senate begin to consider the bill and I should like to have a vote on the bill reached promptly. I shall be willing to agree that we vote tomorrow afternoon or even Saturday or Monday, provided we begin with the bill and at least make some progress on it. Senators talk about economizing and saving money for the Government and reducing the cost of the Government; and certainly we shall save time and money and cost to the Government if we proceed within reason, allowing each Senator to submit any amendment he desires to submit.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The difficulty is that we cannot do that if a point of order is made against consideration of the bill today.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the matter now under discussion is the regular order; and I desire to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question, if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to ask whether the distinguished Senator will agree to give the Senate assurance that, if the bill is taken up today, after the Senator from New Mexico makes his explanation and the Senate adopts all committee amendments about which there is no controversy, any amendments which Senators wish to have passed over until tomorrow will go over until that time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection to that procedure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. First, let me point out to the distinguished Senator that, as he well knows, the Senate has a right to require that the report on the bill lie over 1 day.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question as to that.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Mexico is asking the Senate to forego that right and to take up the bill immediately. I say to the distinguished Senator—and I think I express the sentiments of many Members on this side of the aisle and of at least some Members on the other side of the aisle—that a number of Senators are requesting that

the Senator from New Mexico proceed with the bill and make any explanation of it that he wishes to make, but they feel that they should have a right to offer, tomorrow, amendments calling for cuts or increases in appropriation items before those items are finally voted on.

In view of the fact that the bill could lie over 1 day, anyway, I do not believe such a request is unreasonable.

I should like to agree with the suggestion of the majority leader; in fact, I would agree, so far as I personally am concerned. On the other hand, I am not sure that all other Senators will agree, because many of them are not sure what items in the bill are controversial, and some which are considered controversial today might not be considered controversial tomorrow, and vice versa.

I wish to cooperate with the Senator from New Mexico. Why do not we agree to the motion to take up the bill at this time, with the full understanding that no votes will be taken until tomorrow, and that any Senator who wishes to offer an amendment may do so at any time either today or tomorrow, even though we may approve today certain committee amendments calling for increases or decreases in salary items in the bill? What is wrong with such an arrangement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Let me ask what is wrong with this—and I hope the Senator will give me his attention—

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; but another Senator on this side of the aisle just said that objection might be made to that arrangement, and I was wondering what was wrong with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, what is wrong with this: Some Senators think they may wish to submit amendments tomorrow? That will be perfectly satisfactory to me. I am trying to cooperate with Senators on the other side of the aisle in respect to economizing and using to advantage the time of the Senate this afternoon, at least to the extent of adopting the amendments as to which there is no controversy, and trying to reach an agreement that if Senators offer amendments tomorrow, at least we may agree about the time when amendments which are passed over temporarily will be voted on and also when amendments which are submitted tomorrow will be voted on. Can we agree to vote at, let us say, 5 o'clock tomorrow, or to begin voting then?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not know that question was to come up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am asking the Senator, What is the matter with it?

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska is perfectly ready to start on the bill today, and to vote on it today; but, speaking for Senators who are not present, I must insist that their rights be protected, and, therefore, that the bill lie over for 1 day. I do not object and I am sure those Senators would not object to taking up the bill having a full discussion of it, with an explanation of every item, and voting on the committee amendments as fast as desired. But I certainly think Senators should have the right tomorrow to offer any amendment

to increase or decrease any appropriation, whether it involves salaries or other items of the bill. That is not unreasonable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course; and I would not think it unreasonable if my good friend from Nebraska even wished to economize.

Mr. WHERRY. And, of course, I do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to be of assistance along that line.

Mr. WHERRY. But there are Senators who want to increase the total amount of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would there be any objection to fixing a time for the vote?

Mr. WHERRY. No. So far as I am concerned, if the distinguished Senator wants to make a unanimous-consent request that we proceed to the consideration of the bill and that tomorrow an amendment may be offered to increase or decrease any salary item or any other item of the bill, and that there be a limitation of debate beginning, say, at the hour of 4 o'clock, with 30 minutes on each amendment, I should not object. I believe the Senate would be agreeable to a limitation of debate of any amendment. But I want Senators to be able to offer any amendment they desire, to any item of appropriation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So do I.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, may I ask if it is his understanding that, under his proposition, if the bill is taken up today and the committee amendments are voted on—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Except those which some Senator asks to have go over until tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN. That any committee amendment adopted today would be subject to an amendment tomorrow, in case a Senator found out during the night that the amount should be increased or decreased?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator knows that it is possible to move to reconsider, and there will be no objection, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is probably correct about that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There will be no objection. If any amendment which may be adopted this afternoon should appear to a Senator overnight to have been wrongfully adopted, and if he wants to move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, and to propose an amendment to it, the Senator from New Mexico will have no objection.

Mr. AIKEN. I have participated in this debate for two reasons. First, I am strongly opposed to requiring the President of the United States to assume the responsibility which is given to the Congress in regard to making appropriations and fixing amounts. I may say also that during the past 10 years, I have seen many appropriation bills come into the Senate, Senators finding them on their desks, and passing them within a matter of 3 or 4 hours' time on the same day. It seems to me that is not good legislative practice.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the Senator is possibly correct. But there are certain

items of the bill which are not controversial, and we can gain a little time by acting on them today. I simply do not want to waste the time of the Senate. I thought we might at least make a little headway.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the situation is apparent. As a matter of fact, I thought the report had been filed yesterday; otherwise, I should not have moved to take up the bill. The only way we can take up the bill is by unanimous consent, and it is obvious that the only way we can get that done is to agree that any amendment may be offered tomorrow, either to amendments or to the bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, and that any Senator, tomorrow, may have the right to offer an amendment to any amendment, or to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is agreeable.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it to be understood that up to the time of the final consideration of the bill, any Senator may offer an amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Any Senator may offer an amendment, either to increase it or to decrease an item. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly what I said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to continue reading the statement I made in the subcommittee at the time the Secretary of Labor and representatives of the Federal Security were before it. That was on April 8. I want my good friend from Michigan to turn to page 2 of the hearings. At the beginning of the hearings—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Arizona for suggesting the unanimous-consent agreement. I think it solves all our problems.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the beginning of the hearings, in order to carry out what I think the Senator from Michigan and I may say, practically all or, indeed all other Senators have in mind in the way of giving consideration to the financial status of the country, the load of the taxpayer, and the waste of public moneys, I made a statement which I now

desire to read. At page 4 of the report, I said:

FISCAL PROBLEMS TO REQUIRE CLOSE ANALYSIS OF BUDGET ESTIMATE

The members of our committee are cognizant of the difficult problem with which we are confronted. The Congress has a responsibility to the American people to protect the solvency of our Government and to maintain a balanced economy. We hope that witnesses on behalf of the departments will be so guided. I hope we will not be subjected to witnesses stoutly defending as essential, programs and activities linked with certain nostrums and panaceas. It is going to be difficult enough to win approval of funds for bona fide essentials; the spectacle of witnesses consuming the time of the committee in behalf of some luxury item may well result in a disallowance of funds for even essential projects.

It is the hope of the committee that the departments and agencies affected by this appropriation bill will, of their own volition, tell the committee where cuts can be made and show the Congress and the American people that the departments understand the economic situation as it exists and are, therefore, willing to be austere themselves. That procedure will be preferable—that is, to have the departments do their own cutting and so state to Congress; but, if necessary, this committee and the Congress must do the cutting.

Now, what I have in mind, Mr. Secretary, by that last statement is this: I am sure that, as far as the higher echelons of Government are concerned, the ones who really have the responsibility of carrying out the administrative duties of every department, they realize the situation in the country as it exists. This is stern reality. We are in an awful mess. If it is at all possible within reason to have nonessentials cut I think that would be so much more preferable. I think the departments would stand in better grace with the Congress if the departments themselves were to tell us, "Now, listen, members of the committee, while it is true that we would like to carry out this particular program, as in everyday affairs of life, we can't always do what we want, even for our own immediate families and we are going to suggest that these cuts be made by the committee."

Now, Mr. Secretary, at your convenience, we will be glad to hear whatever you care to say.

That statement, Mr. President, was made because the committee fully appreciated its position and understood that it had grave responsibilities to the American taxpayers. Throughout the hearings that very point was in mind.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to what the committee did in the way of appropriations and in reducing certain appropriations. If the Members of the Senate will turn to pages 1 and 2 of the committee report—they will note that the amount of the bill as passed by the House was \$2,641,206,361. The Senate committee lowered that amount to the net extent of \$112,867,530, the total amount of the Senate bill being \$2,437,192,064.

The budget estimate for 1952 was \$2,744,253,760. The bill as reported to the Senate, which is in the amount of \$2,528,338,831, is \$91,146,767 above the 1951 appropriation, but it is under the budget estimate in the amount of \$215,914,929.

Let me again emphasize that the amount of the bill as passed by the other House has been reduced by \$112,867,530, and the appropriations provided are \$215,914,929 under the budget estimate for this year. That reduction was made after extensive hearings extending from the third of April until approximately 2 weeks ago. The subcommittee went deeply and extensively into every detail, as was intended when I made my statement at the start of the hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I should like to invite attention to the breakdown of the reductions and how they compare with past appropriations, budget estimates, House allowances, and Senate allowances.

On page 2 of the committee report it will be noted that in 1951 for the Department of Labor there was appropriated \$230,906,360. The budget estimate this year was \$231,289,000. The House allowed \$223,506,500. The Senate committee's recommendation was \$223,536,601.

The appropriation is practically \$7,000,000 lower than was the appropriation for 1951, and it is \$7,752,399 below the budget estimate, but it is \$30,101 above the House allowance.

The reason why I give the Senate those figures—and I wish my friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] were present on the floor—is in order to show that the subcommittee and the full committee desire the Senate and the people of the country to understand that we appreciate the financial condition of the Government and the condition of the taxpayers.

The Senate committee's allowance for the Federal Security Agency is approximately \$25,000,000 under the allowance for 1951; it is \$157,087,395 under the budget estimate, and approximately \$62,000,000 under the House allowance.

Generally, Mr. President, as those who know the history of appropriations in this body are aware, when the House did any cutting the Senate would, as a general rule, increase the amount of the appropriation. The Senate was supposed to be the restoring body. But, again, the subcommittee, including such Senators as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is the ranking minority member, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], other Senators, and myself, wanted to show the country that we were endeavoring to make a little saving wherever it was possible and within sound reason, and without jeopardizing the carrying out of the proper functions of Government. We did not want to jeopardize one single essential function of Government, and we do not think that what we have recommended will have that result. We thought then and think now that every penny of the appropriations the committee has suggested to this body is

absolutely essential, and we cut only as to those functions which possibly could wait in whose appropriations a cut was justified. That does not mean that the subcommittee or the committee as a whole does not believe in the programs being carried on; we do believe in them. They include hospital construction and public health activities. I am satisfied that more money could be used in these programs to the advantage of the welfare of the United States, but, under the circumstances, we feel that the committee allowed all that could be justified at the moment.

With reference to the National Labor Relations Board, the committee recommends an amount, \$328,541, under the 1951 appropriation and \$348,541 under the budget estimate. But we increased by \$233,959 the House allowance. We felt justified in doing that, and, as we come to the amendments which pertain to those items, they will be justified.

The next item is the National Mediation Board. As to that item the Senate committee's recommendation is \$11,753 under the House allowance, \$59,753 under the budget estimate, and \$360,253 under last year's appropriation.

In the case of the Railroad Retirement Board, there is an increase of \$124,529,495 compared with 1951 appropriations. At the time that item comes before the Senate for consideration, we will justify it. But the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee is \$50,465,591 under the budget estimate for 1952, and \$50,465,591 under the House allowance.

In the case of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee is \$96,050 above the 1951 appropriations, \$201,250 below the 1952 budget estimates, and \$96,750 above the House allowance.

Mr. President, I believe the figures shown by the tables appeal to those who want the Government to function on a sound basis and to have it properly administered. We must have a government, Mr. President. We have created the agencies in question. We have created the programs administered by the agencies. We have written certain philosophies in the law, and it is necessary that Congress provide adequate funds, not to be wasted, in order to carry out the proper functions of government that should be carried out in a country such as ours.

Mr. President, I am proud of the record of the subcommittee. I am proud of the cuts it has made. As I stated, the cuts were made in many instances reluctantly, because individual members of the subcommittee believed in programs in which they were particularly interested. I wish we had been able to recommend a larger sum than was requested by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] for a particular item in which he was interested, and in behalf of which he appeared before the subcommittee. Having heard the testimony given by my good friend before the subcommittee, I am positive he

believes that what we allowed was all that could be allowed at this particular time.

Mr. HUNT rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish we had been able to recommend a larger appropriation for cancer research. If I could have had my way I would have allowed \$20,000,000 more for that activity, and I would have allowed more for research into heart ailments.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming in a moment.

More than 900,000 persons suffering from mental illness are inmates in public institutions, without considering those who are being taken care of privately by individual families. It is my contention that American citizens, the families of the unfortunates, and the public officials who deal with them, have a sacred trust to perform. The Senator from New Mexico is not happy over the little mite we allowed for research and investigation of mental illness in the United States. The Senator from New Mexico, however, has a duty to perform, and the subcommittee members felt that what we allowed was all we possibly could allow at the moment.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the junior Senator from Wyoming is very grateful to him for the way he and his subcommittee received him, and for the amount of increase that was allowed. While perhaps we would have liked to receive and could well have used more money, we are well satisfied with the action taken by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Delaware. I should have yielded to him previously. However, my attention was distracted, and I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senator to the item in the appropriation contained in the bill referring to the Railroad Retirement Board. What is the obligation of the Government with respect to the Retirement Board? I ask the question so we may have the answer in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Delaware has a copy of the bill before him, I suggest that he turn to page 38.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in connection with that Board the United States Government is trustee for this fund?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Under the law the fund goes into the Treasury, and necessary money must be appropriated by Congress. The money to meet current retirement payments, to set up the reserve retirement fund, and to meet administrative costs, all come out of the special tax for this fund. It does not come out

of any money raised by what we call taxes placed upon the taxpayers of the country generally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This is the way it applies in a practical way. So much of the tax is collected from the employer and so much from the employee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is how I understand it, and my reason for asking the question is so we may have the record straight.

The next question is: That being true, is not the \$50,000,000 to which the Senator refers false economy?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; it is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator cannot claim that the \$50,000,000 represents a cut in the bill, because it is not our money in the first place.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; it is not false economy, as the Senator states.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But, so far as the ultimate answer is concerned, it is immaterial whether it is paid out this year or next year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. It happens that in this instance it is money that we have previously overpaid the agency.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But it is still money paid by the railroad employees and the railroad companies that we are handling as a trust fund.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. This is money that was overpaid, and which we are now holding from the appropriation of the trust.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator explain to us how he arrived at the \$50,000,000 cut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We arrived at the \$50,000,000 cut for the simple reason that we had overpaid that amount, and reduced it to that extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that; but I did not see anywhere a breakdown of this amount. It is not exactly \$50,000,000. I simply wondered where I could find a breakdown of the amount. The amount is \$50,465,591, so there must be a breakdown of it somewhere.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is. Let me read from page 11 of the report of the committee, under the head of "Payment to railroad retirement account":

The committee recommends, as a substitute, provision for an annual specific appropriation in lieu of the annual indefinite as passed by the House and the permanent indefinite as proposed in the budget estimate.

The committee recommendation is \$50,465,591 less than the budget estimate and the House allowance, neither of which recognized the credit outstanding for prior years' overpayment, resulting from the overestimating of net tax collections upon which figure the annual specific appropriation has been based, adjusted for prior years' experience.

If the Senator will turn to page 837 of the hearings, he will find a table headed "Comparison of carriers' tax collections with amounts appropriated to

the Board for railroad retirement purposes and benefit payments, by fiscal years, 1936-51."

In the summary the Senator will note how we arrive at the \$50,000,000:

Summary

Total amount of appropriations chargeable to tax collections, 1936 through 1951 (column 5)-----	\$4,395,201,269.16
Net carriers' tax collections, 1936 through 1951 (column 6)-----	4,344,735,677.72
Difference-----	50,465,591.44

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator for that information. I should like to ask one further question. I notice that the bill still calls for an appropriation of \$91,000,000 more than the appropriation for 1951. Unquestionably this is a domestic agency. If every domestic agency is to have its appropriations increased this year, and in addition we have our military appropriations, from what source is there going to be any economy in the Government? Just why should it cost \$91,000,000 more to operate this civilian agency?

Mr. CHAVEZ. This is another year. Conditions are different than they were in fiscal year 1951. During the past 12 months, or since the fiscal year 1951 started, conditions have arisen which were unknown at that particular time. Irrespective of the merits of the question, we are in an emergency, and Congress has taken certain legislative steps in order to meet the situation. Of necessity, the Government load has increased. That is the reason, in this particular instance, why there is an increase in the appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is true that certain new agencies have been created during the emergency, but—

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understood, the question was in general terms. So far as it applies to this particular bill—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was not asking for a specific breakdown at this time; I am referring to the increase.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; but let me point out the situation so far as this particular bill is concerned, because that is what we are dealing with at the moment. I am proud of the effort of the committee to make reductions. Let me read the following general statement from page 3 of the report:

The committee recommends a total of \$2,528,338,831, a reduction of \$112,867,530 under the House allowance, and \$215,914,929 under the 1952 budget estimates, but \$91,146,767 more than the 1951 appropriations. The substantial increase over the 1951 appropriations results partially from the abandonment of contract authority—there was provided \$100,000,000 in contractual obligational authority for the hospital and school construction programs during the current fiscal year but for which fiscal year 1952 new obligational authority in the form of cash is provided. Another major factor in the increase is the additional allowance for payment to the railroad retirement account, \$124,529,485 more than the 1951 appropriation, but with respect to which the Con-

gress has little effective control, the appropriation being the estimated net tax collections under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, adjusted for prior payments.

That was the reason for the increase. However, notwithstanding the increase in this particular item, as a whole, as compared with what the budget contained, and what the House allowed the bill, as reported by the Senate Committee is still \$112,000,000 lower than the House figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I feel sure that the Senator from New Mexico will agree with me that we must cut much deeper than 3 or 4 percent below the estimates if we are to balance the budget or come anywhere near it. We must make most of the cuts in the civilian departments of the Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Delaware is correct. However, the Senator from New Mexico has his own views as to a complaint about a \$40,000 item in the Department of Labor when we are appropriating billions of dollars. I have my own views on that question, which I shall express at the appropriate time, when appropriations for particular agencies are reached.

My individual opinion is that some of the so-called foreign aid could be curtailed to a great extent. I wish we had a little more money for our hospitals. I wish we had a little more money for flood protection. In my judgment, a flood is just as devastating, if not more so, and does just as much damage in the Missouri or Mississippi or Hudson River Valleys, or in New Mexico, as does a flood which occurs in Europe. At least I am more concerned about it, anyway. I think we owe just as much of an obligation to our own people as we do to the people of Europe. So I believe we could reduce some of the appropriations for foreign aid, and possibly carry out the purpose which the Senator from Delaware has in mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator have available the number of civilian employees in the various agencies referred to in this bill, as compared with the number of employees for the past 2 or 3 years. I ask for this in order that we may see whether or not the agencies are reducing the number of their employees, as they should be doing?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have the information, and I will furnish it to the Senator. It so happens that it does not appear in the hearings, but we have it. We required that information of the agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I to understand, it will be available before the bill is passed?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I will furnish it to the Senator during the afternoon.

Mr. President, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement, I believe that the Senate would be justified in adopting the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNING) (in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hendrickson	Millikin
Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Moody
Benton	Hill	Morse
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Ives	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carlson	Kefauver	Saltmire
Chavez	Kerr	Schepel
Clements	Kilgore	Smathers
Connally	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Langer	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Stennis
Douglas	Lodge	Taft
Duff	Long	Thye
Dworshak	Magnuson	Tobey
Eastland	Malone	Underwood
Eaton	Maybank	Watkins
Ellender	McCarran	Welker
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wherry
Flanders	McClellan	Wiley
Frear	McFarland	Williams
George	McKellar	Young
Green	McMahon	
Hayden		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2918) for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff.

SENATOR WATKINS' FIGHT FOR REVISION OF THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] deserves special commendation for the fight he has been carrying on for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947.

When the Italian Peace Treaty was brought before the Senate for ratification, the Senator from Utah argued that the treaty would render Italy militarily helpless in the face of Communist aggression and would deny her the means of self-preservation. He pointed out that the reparations provisions of the treaty would saddle Italy with economic servitude and would impede her recovery. He charged that the territorial and other provisions of the treaty were departures from the announced principles of the Atlantic Charter.

That was some 4 years ago. The Senator from Utah has never let up in his fight for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty. His most recent activity is illustrated by a clipping I have before me from the May 31, 1951, issue of the New

York Times. It is a published letter to the editor in which the Senator from Utah restates the need for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty. I request unanimous consent that his letter and the editorial to which it refers be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. KEM. In April 1951, when the troops-for-Europe issue was before the Senate, the Senator from Utah proposed an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 99 expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should seek to eliminate the provisions of the Italian Peace Treaty which impose limitations on the military strength of Italy and today prevent her from carrying her proper share of the burden for the defense of Western Europe. The Senate, by a vote of 67 to 20, adopted that amendment.

The persistent campaign of the Senator from Utah for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty has won him many friends and supporters, especially among Americans of Italian ancestry. He has received hundreds of messages of encouragement and praise from all over the United States and from abroad. The letters he has received from Italy have been especially warm and enthusiastic. The following paragraph from a letter to the Senator from Utah from Ambrogio Ranzini, of Italy's National Ex-Servicemen's and Veterans' Association, illustrates how Italians feel about the Senator:

Excellency, for your defense of Italy and your insistence on justice for my country and because yours is the voice of a friend overseas, I, an Italian, want to extend to you my gratitude. I know that we have humble but good Italians over here who are able to do their share in bringing about true peace in the world and the triumph of civilization; men who in their hearts feel love for all nations, on whom the United States will always be able to count as good friends, real Italians who want neither communism nor slavism.

The Italian language press in America has been equally enthusiastic in its praise of the Senator from Utah. One such newspaper, *La Follia di New York*, carried a front-page editorial in its March 15, 1951 issue under the headline: "A name that Italians must not forget—ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican Senator of Utah."

The lead sentence of that editorial said:

Here is a name (ARTHUR V. WATKINS) which Italy must write with letters of gold into the annals of its modern history.

I am proud to be associated with the Senator from Utah in his fight for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty. I hope that before many days are out the Department of State will heed the will of the Senate of the United States as shown by its recent adoption of the Watkins amendment, and will move for revision of the treaty. Italy must be placed in the position so that she can do what she

wishes to do, that is, contribute her fair share for the defense of the West, against the world-wide threat of communism.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of May 31, 1951]
REVISING ITALY'S TREATY—HALT TO REPARATIONS, SUPPORT FOR APPLICATION FOR U. N. SEAT ADVOCATED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES: The editorial Italy's Peace Treaty, which appeared in your May 22 issue, was most disappointing. The Times draws a distinction between the preamble and the clauses of the treaty and cautiously notes that "the time is doubtless soon approaching when Italy will formally and officially apply to the Big Three for revision of the clauses of the peace treaty." The concluding sentence of the editorial expresses the cautious hope that "when that time comes there should be no hesitation in agreeing to the proposal."

On April 2, by a vote of 67 to 20, the United States Senate adopted the Watkins amendment to Senate Resolution 99, expressing "the sense of the Senate that the United States should seek to eliminate all provisions of the existing treaty with Italy which impose limitations upon the military strength of Italy and prevent the performance by Italy of her obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty to contribute to the full extent of her capacity to the defense of Western Europe." In view of this expression of the viewpoint of the United States Senate, the initiative for revision of the Italian peace treaty should have been taken by the Department of State some weeks ago. To date, nothing has been done.

Now comes the New York Times to suggest that "the time is doubtless soon approaching" for Italy formally and officially to "apply" for revision of the clauses of the peace treaty.

PAYMENTS TO RUSSIA

The Times contends that the proposal for the discontinuance of Italian reparations to Russia pursuant to the requirements of the Italian peace treaty poses a problem which "is delicate and complicated and will need study" because it "impinges on the whole vast problem of reparations, not only to Russia but to other allies and not only of Italy but of Germany and Austria."

In my view, Italy, Germany, and Austria cannot be expected to make an effective contribution to the economic, political, and military strengthening of Western Europe so long as they are compelled to pay tribute to Russia or any of the other military victors of the Second World War. Continued insistence on the letter of the postwar punishments which were visited upon war-torn and devastated "losers" in the Second World War is contradictory of all efforts to bring those nations back into the European family and into the United Nations. Thus, there should be little hesitation in rejecting the nervous note of caution voiced by the Times in respect to the "problem" of reparations.

The Times editorial of May 22 finds it "hard to see the necessity for 'abolishing' the preamble of the Italian peace treaty," inasmuch as it merely "states the historic fact that Italy joined with Germany and Japan in making war on the Allies" and "history cannot be rewritten or expunged from the records."

ALLIES' PLEDGE

It should be pointed out that the preamble of the Italian peace treaty does more than state a few facts of recent history. It is in the preamble that the Allied and associated Powers specifically promised "to

support Italy's application to become a member of the United Nations. * * * It is significant to note that that pledge, which was solemnly subscribed to 4 years ago, has been openly repudiated by one of the signatories, Soviet Russia, through the repeated (four times) use of the veto power to block Italy's request for admission to the United Nations.

The effort of the other signatories to bring about fulfillment of the pledge have not been so marked by determination and vigor as to inspire spontaneous widespread belief in their sincerity.

It occurs to me that the United States should open its eyes to reality in respect to the Italian peace treaty. The treaty has been repudiated and nullified by Russia. It should be denounced by the United States. The very least we can do is press for its revision.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senator from Utah.
WASHINGTON, May 28, 1951.

EXHIBIT B

[From the New York Times of May 22, 1951]
ITALY'S PEACE TREATY

Count Sforza has again proposed that the Italian Peace Treaty be revised. The timing of this request a week before the crucial municipal elections was doubtless calculated. At the height of the electoral campaign in the spring of 1948, a judicious declaration by the United States, Britain, and France favoring the return of Trieste to Italy undoubtedly gained votes for the anti-Communist side. This time the same countries are unfortunately prevented from expressing an opinion by the agenda talks now fruitlessly taking place among the Big Four in Paris. The United States, for instance, cannot on the one hand fight to get the Russian satellites to observe their peace treaties and on the other destroy the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty.

However, this is a technicality that one hopes will soon be removed. The satellites, with Russian incitement and help, have armed far beyond the limits set in their treaties. To force Italy to keep within the limits prescribed in her own treaty is dangerous folly. Treaties cannot be violated by one side and made sacred and binding on the other. It is not that any number of wrongs make a right but that international relations must live up to certain accepted norms. When the basis for such relations is broken the superstructure cannot be held up.

The point that Count Sforza makes about Italy being forced to supply Russia with war materials as reparations at a time when the west is trying to embargo such goods is well taken. However, it impinges on the whole vast problem of reparations, not only to Russia but to other allies and not only of Italy but of Germany and Austria. The problem is delicate and complicated and will need study. In addition, it is hard to see the necessity for abolishing the preamble of the peace treaty, as Premier de Gasperi recently suggested. It states the historic fact that Italy joined with Germany and Japan in making war on the Allies. With all due respects to the Russians, who are past masters at the art, history cannot be rewritten or expunged from the records.

The time is doubtless soon approaching when Italy will formally and officially apply to the Big Three for the revision of the clauses of the peace treaty. When that time comes there should be no hesitation in agreeing to the proposal.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor,

the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief observation before we proceed. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, nothing can be done until tomorrow; or, stating it in other language, anything which is done today can be undone tomorrow. That being the case, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, except those in controversy, and except the amendments which are to be offered from the floor, as to which the chairman of the subcommittee has given proper notice of motions to suspend the rules, to enable those amendments to be offered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object, as I understand the request—let me say that the Senator from Michigan, for himself and other Senators, will offer an amendment. In order that the Senate may know what it is, I shall read it:

On page 42, lines 15 and 16, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 703. Each appropriation or authorization made by this act for any purpose, of which a specified portion is herein made available for personal services, and each amount so specified as being available for personal services, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think I understand the purposes of the amendment, and what the amendment is designed to accomplish. I have no objection to having it discussed, either this afternoon or tomorrow, in order that proceedings on the bill may be expedited. I presume that the amendments which are to be submitted tomorrow will not affect the entire bill, and that we could at least get through with certain of the committee amendments, and then, if any Senator wanted to amend any part of the bill, that could enter into the picture. That is my reason for making the unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from New Mexico designate amendment "A" as a controversial amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Let me tell the Senator from Maryland as to that. I shall have to move to suspend the rules in order to offer that amendment, because it proposes basic legislation. It will not come up until the other committee amendments shall have been adopted.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that the Senator from Maryland will possibly agree to vote to suspend the rules, because it is very necessary that the amendment be adopted in order to carry out the

purposes of the Wherry Act so far as the institution referred to in the amendment is concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that all committee amendments, with the exception of the so-called Cordon amendment and the amendments lettered "A" and "B," as to which I have given notice of motions to suspend the rules, be adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I take it that, as a consequence of the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Mexico, we would under his proposal adopt all noncontroversial committee amendments and then, tomorrow, consider such committee amendments as may be objected to and amendments formulated and offered from the floor, including amendments to the appropriations made by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct. The only thing which will be accomplished, in the event my request is granted, is that as to amendments which are not objected to, and which are not intended to be amended, we will not be required to go through this same process again tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The consequence would be that we would not be able to discuss the budget this afternoon, or be able to act on the budget this afternoon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want the Senator to discuss it this afternoon, if he desires, and I would have no objection if he would propose a modification to my request, or would care to have me modify it, so that the discussion of the bill and the budget figures, or whatever the Senator may have in mind with reference to the bill, could proceed this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the intention of the Senator to carry on tomorrow and push for final passage tomorrow?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not necessarily. It would be my hope that we could reach a final vote tomorrow; but it is not my intention to press for a vote until every Senator interested has had an opportunity to have his say. But I think agreement to my request would expedite matters and would actually save time which might otherwise be consumed in going over the same amendments which we could take up now, provided there is no objection to them, and tomorrow we could, if desired, even return to such amendments; otherwise, their consideration will have been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LEHMAN. Reserving the right to object, I am concerned about one phase of the request. I think the Senator from New Mexico and my other colleagues realize that I am as anxious as anyone on this floor to have legislation expedited. As a matter of fact, I frankly have been very critical of delays on the part of the Congress in enacting certain legislation, so that my very deep interest is in getting important legislation enacted as promptly as possible. Never-

theless, it seems to me that as to a bill so important as is this one, going into many phases of our national life, there should be a reasonable amount of time given for the consideration of the report and the bill, and for discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to my good friend from New York an agreement has already been reached as to time for consideration of the bill. All I now ask is that in order not to waste time tomorrow with amendments of the type referred to by the Senator, the Senate proceed under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been arrived at. We have not agreed on any particular time to vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may continue my thought for a moment, I am very much interested in some of the items in the bill. My present tendency is to consider submitting amendments which might even increase the appropriation for certain health measures and other measures which I think are of great interest.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My request will not prevent the Senator from submitting amendments.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not desire to submit any unless I have substantiating data and evidence which would justify them. I am in receipt of telephone calls and have had visits from persons deeply interested in the treatment of cancer, in hospitals, and in various other health activities. I do not wish to submit amendments unless I have the facts. On the other hand, I do not want to fail in my duty toward the people and toward sound activities. I do not intend to object to the request, but I believe we should have time to consider the report and the bill carefully, to listen to the debate, and to hear from some of our constituents.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the reason why I agreed to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered, and the noncontroversial committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 13, after the word "public," to strike out "\$1,425,000" and insert "\$1,400,000, of which not more than \$1,250,136 shall be available for personal services."

In line 16, after the word "Solicitor," to strike out "\$1,650,000" and insert "\$1,669,445, of which not more than \$1,530,546 shall be available for personal services."

On page 3, line 10, after the figures "\$688,000," to insert "of which not more than \$604,870 shall be available for personal services."

In line 23, after the word "Marine," to strike out "\$277,000" and insert "\$265,758, of which not more than \$213,603 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Apprenticeship," on page 4, line 5, after "(29 U. S. C. 50)," to strike out "\$2,692,000" and insert "\$2,578,682, of which not more than \$2,153,049 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Employment Security," on page 4, line 20, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)," to strike out "\$4,635,500"

and insert "\$5,245,959"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$743,500" and insert "\$1,513,765"; and in line 23, after the numerals "1944", to insert "and of which not more than \$4,351,773 shall be available for personal services."

On page 5, line 11, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$165,560,000" and insert "\$164,560,000, of which not more than \$647,037 shall be available for personal services, and"; and in line 13, after the word "which", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Employees' Compensation," on page 7, line 19, after the word "Appeals", to strike out "1,947,000" and insert "\$1,887,816, of which not more than \$1,618,499 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics," on page 9, line 7, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$5,243,000" and insert "\$5,371,352, of which not more than \$4,530,755 shall be available for personal services."

In line 16, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,125,000, of which not more than \$991,323 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Women's Bureau," on page 9, line 22, after the word "exhibits", to strike out "\$389,000" and insert "379,285, of which not more than \$317,581 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division," on page 10, line 11, after the word "Division", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$8,365,304, of which not more than \$7,119,227 shall be available for personal services."

Under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Columbia Institution for the Deaf," on page 11, line 13, after the word "improvements", to strike out "\$390,000" and insert "\$374,537, of which not more than \$293,805 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Food and Drug Administration," on page 12, line 7, after the word "operations", to strike out "\$5,345,000" and insert "\$5,172,975, of which not more than \$4,218,475 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Freedmen's Hospital," on page 13, line 8, after the word "university", to strike out "\$2,906,500" and insert "\$2,631,500, of which not more than \$2,053,786 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Howard University," on page 13, line 18, after the word "grounds", to strike out "\$2,525,000" and insert "\$2,415,084."

Under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 14, line 20, after "(Public Law 462)", to strike out "\$18,223,261" and insert "\$20,017,760"; in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$18,048,261" and insert "\$19,847,760"; and in the same line, after the word "year", to strike out the colon and "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations."

On page 15, line 20, after the word "same", to strike out "\$3,253,000" and insert "\$3,397,706, of which not more than \$2,893,577 shall be available for personal services, and."

On page 16, line 9, after "(Public Law 874)", to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such act."

On page 16, after line 11, to strike out: "Grants for school construction: For grants for emergency school construction to school districts in federally affected areas as authorized by the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority provided under this head in the

Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall be available for reimbursement payments under section 205 (c) (1) of such act with respect to school facilities completed before July 1, 1951: *Provided further*, That in determining relative urgency of need for purposes of prescribing, under section 206 (d) of such act, the order in which certifications for payments from this appropriation shall be made (other than payments in liquidation of contractual obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1951), the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the extent to which the school facilities are needed in the interests of national defense."

On page 17, after line 5, insert:

"SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

"For providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by title II of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted for the foregoing purpose in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951."

Under the subhead "Office of Vocational Rehabilitational," on page 17, line 24, after the word "agency", to strike out "\$20,475,000" and insert "\$21,500,000, of which not more than \$87,346 shall be available for personal services, and."

On page 19, line 2, after the word "films", to strike out "\$705,000" and insert "\$675,620, of which not more than \$558,220 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 20, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty"; and in line 13, after the word "determine", to strike out "\$11,700,000" and insert "\$11,653,360, of which not more than \$2,786,157 shall be available for personal services."

On page 20, line 17, after the word "act", to strike out "\$8,745,000" and insert "\$8,887,351, of which not more than \$2,140,323 shall be available for personal services."

On page 21, line 3, after the figures "\$15,960,000", to insert "of which not more than \$1,900,944 shall be available for personal services."

On page 21, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty"; and in line 13, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$6,090,000" and insert "\$5,915,747, of which not more than \$4,450,816 shall be available for personal services."

On page 22, line 1, after the word "only", to strike out "\$3,710,000" and insert "\$3,648,158, of which not more than \$2,885,004 shall be available for personal services."

On page 22, line 19, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$1,234,000" and insert "\$1,211,129, of which not more than \$434,547 shall be available for personal services."

On page 23, line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$175,000,000" and insert "\$195,000,000."

On page 23, in line 19, after the word "only", to strike out "\$1,195,000" and insert "\$1,166,465, of which not more than \$1,017,165 shall be available for personal services."

On page 24, line 20, after the word "only", to strike out "\$2,990,000" and insert "\$2,868,029, of which not more than \$2,507,458 shall be available for personal services."

On page 25, line 8, after the word "compounds", to strike out "\$15,500,000" and insert "\$15,559,973, of which not more than \$4,560,505 shall be available for personal services."

On page 25, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "four" and insert "six"; and in line 20, after the word "act", to strike

out "\$19,500,000" and insert "\$19,805,171, of which not more than \$2,694,760 shall be available for personal services."

On page 26, line 3, after the word "dis-eases", to strike out "\$10,300,000" and insert "\$10,737,974, of which not more than \$1,178,489 shall be available for personal services."

On page 26, line 11, after the word "only", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$10,072,982, of which not more than \$1,463,333 shall be available for personal services."

On page 26, in line 17, after the word "conditions", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,697,308, of which not more than \$1,001,156 shall be available for personal services."

On page 27, line 4, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "\$10,400,000" and insert "\$9,445,000, together with \$955,000 to be derived by transfer from funds provided for the construction of additional auxiliary structures under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951."

On page 27, line 19, after the numerals "1951", to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$250,000."

On page 27, line 22, after the word "head", to strike out "\$6,640,000" and insert "\$6,635,540, of which not more than \$84,740 shall be available for personal services."

On page 28, line 9, after the word "officers", to strike out "\$1,790,000" and insert "\$1,861,500, of which not more than \$731,500 shall be available for personal services."

On page 29, line 2, after the word "only", to strike out "\$2,850,000" and insert "\$2,745,868, of which not more than \$2,320,514 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 29, line 23, after the word "unions", to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "167,650"; and on page 30, line 1, after the word "law", to insert "of which total sum not more than \$614,650 shall be available for personal services."

On page 30, line 7, after the word "than", to strike out "\$58,000,000" and insert "\$57,437,980"; and in line 9, after the word "fund", to insert "of which not more than \$48,697,378 shall be available for personal services."

On page 30, line 24, after "64 Stat. 477)", to strike out "\$1,250,000,000" and insert "\$1,150,000,000."

On page 31, line 5, after the word "Assistance", to strike out "\$1,463,400" and insert "\$1,600,000, of which not more than \$1,455,400 shall be available for personal services."

One page 31, line 12, after the word "distribution", to strike out "\$1,450,000" and insert "\$1,500,000, of which not more than \$1,238,900 shall be available for personal services."

On page 32, line 6, after "(42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V)", to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$33,000,000"; and in line 10, after the word "State", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be allotted on a pro rata basis among the several States in proportion to the amounts to which the respective States are entitled for the current fiscal year by reason of section 331 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950."

On page 32, line 18, after the word "Security", to strike out "\$219,700" and insert "\$200,000"; and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$110,300" and insert "\$100,000."

Under the subhead "Office of the Administrator," on page 33, line 15, after the word "Administrator", to strike out "\$2,050,000" and insert "\$2,150,000"; and in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$403,000" and insert "\$413,000."

On page 34, line 4, after the word "fund", to insert "of which total sum not more than

\$402,045 shall be available for personal services."

On page 34, line 12, after the word "Council", to strike out "\$412,000" and insert "\$396,478."

On page 34, line 22, after the word "health", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$75,000."

Under the heading "Title III—National Labor Relations Board," on page 36, line 15, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$8,233,959, of which not more than \$6,622,284 shall be available for personal services."

Under the heading "Title IV—National Mediation Board," on page 37, line 7, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$394,247, of which not more than \$299,307 shall be available for personal services."

On page 37, line 15, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$144,000, of which not more than \$114,000 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "National Railroad Adjustment Board," on page 37, line 22, after the figures "\$600,000", to insert "of which not more than \$460,774 shall be available for personal services and."

Under the heading "Title V—Railroad Retirement Board," on page 38, after line 6, to strike out:

"Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during the current fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (28 U. S. C. 1500-1538)."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient as an annual premium for the payments required under the Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1935, and June 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the latter act, \$562,534,409: *Provided*, That such total amount shall be available until expended for making payments required under said retirement acts, and the amount not required for current payments shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937."

On page 39, line 10, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$5,268,000" and insert "\$5,056,904"; and in line 11, after the word "account", to insert "of which not more than \$4,010,820 shall be available for personal services."

Under the heading "Title VI—Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service," on page 40, line 2, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$2,949,000" and insert "\$3,047,000, of which not more than \$2,566,653 shall be available for personal services."

On page 40, line 11, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$48,750, of which not more than \$23,750 shall be available for personal services."

On page 42, line 16, to change the section number from "704" to "703."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on page 42 of the bill, lines 15 and 16. It is a new section of the bill. I ask that the amendment be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. DIRKSEN) to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 42, between lines 15 and 16, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 703. Each appropriation or authorization made by this act for any purpose, of which a specified portion is herein made available for personal services, and each amount so specified as being available for personal services, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to speak for a few minutes on the amendment.

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THIS AMENDMENT?

It cuts the amounts for personal services specified in the bill by an amount corresponding to 5 percent of the budget request for such personal services.

HOW IS THE CUT APPLIED?

It is applied to these money items:

First. Those appropriations which include personal services; and

Second. The amounts specified therein as being available for personal services.

This is not a double cut. It is necessary to apply the cut to both items, however, since otherwise we would be cutting the amount available for personal services but leaving that amount still in the appropriation and free for expenditure as other expense.

It does not apply to items which the committee had already reduced, for personal services, by 5 percent or more. It does not apply to such items because they do not appear in the bill as specified for personal services under the language the committee incorporated in making its reduction through a limitation.

WHAT WILL BE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF PERSONAL SERVICES CUT IF THIS AMENDMENT PREVAILS?

Ten percent of the amount for personal services requested in the budget. The committee cut personal service appropriations item by item, 5 percent of the budget estimates. We are repeating that process but in a single package rather than item by item. The final result will be a cut of 10 percent in the amounts for personal services requested in the budget.

TIDELANDS OIL—AMENDMENT TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

Mr. HILL. Mr. President. On behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN],

the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and myself, I am submitting an amendment which at the appropriate time we intend to propose to section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

As Senators know, the resolution provides for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. The resolution, as I understand it, proposes to continue the orderly development of oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands during the period the Congress decides how to implement the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in which that Court decided that the United States does own the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of California, Louisiana, and Texas, and that such States do not own the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to their boundaries.

In *U. S. v. California* (332 U. S. 19, June 23, 1947) the Supreme Court stated without equivocation that "California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along the coast." And in *U. S. v. Texas* (339 U. S. 704, October 16, 1950) the Court settled for all time this controversial argument between the United States and the several States by holding that the ownership and proprietary rights to this marginal sea, as well as the governmental powers of regulation and control, was in the United States of America as a whole.

We are offering our amendment in order that it may be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as well as by the Senate. In this way our colleagues may study and consider its purposes and effect.

At this time I do not propose to discuss the section 5 in the present bill except to point out that its effect may be to nullify the decisions of the highest court that this oil belongs to all the American people—all the people—from Alabama to Massachusetts, from Connecticut to Oregon, from Maine to Illinois, from New Hampshire to Tennessee, from Wyoming to Vermont—through their proud claim as United States citizens—not merely to the people of three or four States whose claim is no more than that they were born next door to the oil deposits.

The provisions of the amendment are simple. It proposes to achieve three things:

First. The money from this oil, this public-lands resource of the Nation, is to be dedicated now for the long-range needs of the education of the Nation's children—all its children—and placed in a special account in the Treasury of the United States.

During the present critical period, however, the funds are to be used for national defense purposes. They shall be employed only for urgent developments essential to the national defense and the national security, such develop-

ments to be specifically determined by the Congress. Thereafter, this special account shall be devoted exclusively to our children's education as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

Second. A National Advisory Council on Grants in Aid of Education shall be created. It shall be the function of that Council, which should be named immediately after the resolution becomes law, to study and develop a plan to be reported to the President, who shall submit the report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1953, for the equitable allocation and use of the income from this oil capital for primary, secondary, and higher education.

The Council will consist of 12 persons with experience in the fields of education and/or public administration. Four are to be appointed by the President of the Senate, four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and four by the President of the United States.

The function of this Council is not to be in substitution for the work that is being done to provide Federal aid to elementary and secondary education out of tax revenues. The Federal royalties from these oil deposits cannot be expected to be uniform from year to year, and it is contemplated that the Advisory Council will therefore report on how they can best be utilized as an extra fund out of which can be provided Federal assistance to primary, secondary, and higher education, in addition to such essential aid as the Congress may provide as regular support to education.

It should be emphasized that the proposal in this amendment will not conflict in any manner with, and in fact is a logical extension of the policy which led to the establishment of our prized system of land-grant colleges under the Morrill Act. The endowments and grants under the Morrill Act will continue as they have in the past. It may well be that part of these funds could be used to supplement statutory land or equivalent money endowments of the Morrill Act. It is certainly clear that all the money which has poured into the States under the terms of the Morrill Act in past years would only be a drop in the bucket compared with the funds the several States would receive under this proposal.

Third. Every State or political subdivision which has issued any mineral leases or grants covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, and every grantee of such State or political subdivision shall file with the Attorney General of the United States by December 31, 1951, a statement of the money or other things of value received by such State, political subdivision, or grantee thereof from such leases or grants. The Attorney General shall submit those statements to the Congress not later than February 1, 1952. The object of this provision is to find out what benefit particular States have already had from this property which belongs to all the people.

These three points are the essence of the amendment.

The amendment does not in any way change or effect the provision in the resolution which reads as follows:

Thirty-seven and one-half percent of all moneys received as bonus payments, rents, royalties, and other sums payable with respect to operations in submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year.

This is a generous grant to the tideland oil States.

I sincerely hope that my good friends from California, Louisiana, and Texas, who are fighting so hard to get all of these funds for their own States, will not feel that we are trying to take away from them funds on which they feel the success of their own educational enterprises depend. No sponsor of this amendment wishes to harm the education of children in California or Louisiana or Texas, even though I understand that the great oil fortunes of Texas have already richly endowed education in Texas. Those of us who sponsor this amendment do so, among other reasons, to awaken the Congress and the people of the United States to an understanding of the vastness of the treasure involved—a treasure so vast that there is more than enough to go around; a treasure so vast that to give the children of the other 45 States of the Union their fair share of what belongs to the people of those 45 States as well as the 3 States of California, Louisiana, and Texas, does no injustice to education in those 3 States, even as it does justice to the cause of education in the other 45 States. We feel that one of the reasons for the very possessive attitude of the 3 States which are trying to take a disproportionate share of this treasure of all the States, as well as the comparative lack of interest by the other States, is the little knowledge in all 48 States of the size of the resources involved.

There has been much speculation about the amount of money available to the Treasury of the United States from Tidelands Oil. There can be no really precise determination until the report of the Council proposed by this amendment shall have been submitted to the Congress. I think it would be most helpful to Senators, however, to have the benefit of one or two informed guesses. More than a year ago Dr. E. L. De Golyer of Dallas, Tex., who has an international reputation as one of the most outstanding petroleum geologists of the world, if not the outstanding, stated in *Life* magazine that there may be 10,500,000,000 barrels of oil along the Texas and Louisiana coasts. This figure of 10,500,000,000 barrels excludes oil along the coast line of Florida, Mississippi, and California. The Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior has estimated there may be 13,000,000,000 barrels on the Continental Shelf off Texas and Louisiana. It has also estimated there are 2,000,000,000 barrels off the coast of California. If this Geological Survey estimate of 15,000,000,000 barrels is correct and if to-

day's available price of crude oil is around \$2.70 a barrel, the 15,000,000,000 barrels are worth \$40,500,000,000—more than \$40,000,000,000 belonging to all the people of the United States.

What proportion of this total capital value of oil in place would accrue to the Federal Government in royalties in any given year would, of course, depend on future legislation. What proportion of this total resource in oil would be withdrawn in any year and over a particular period of years may depend upon many things—the going price and the necessity for finding new sources in oil; the shifting reasons of public policy that will dictate whether this oil is to be withdrawn quickly or deliberately conserved over a period; the discoveries of oil elsewhere; the effect of price in the world market; and the availability of substitute forms of power. It is just because of these many factors that the tidelands oil royalties will probably not be available as a fixed amount accruing each year, in contrast to tax funds, which are annually available for the support of the most distressing needs of education.

Whatever the combination of circumstances may be, it is certain that the Federal royalties from whatever amount of this treasure is withdrawn from year to year or over a period of time offer the greatest opportunity to American education since the dedication of a large proportion of our public lands to educational purposes through the land-grant colleges. It is a part of the American tradition and belief in education that our public lands should be dedicated in substantial part to the creation of an even greater public resource—an educated citizenry. Today as we face the crisis of finances in American education we cannot but wish that we had accepted the advice of that far-sighted Massachusetts statesman, President, and Member of Congress, John Quincy Adams, who many years ago attempted to dedicate the public lands of the United States to the particular purposes of public education.

The attempt to dedicate our public lands to the establishment of our land-grant colleges received its most resounding defeat in the nineteenth century from the pen of a President with lesser vision, James Buchanan, when he vetoed the first Morrill Act. It was only when Abraham Lincoln, mindful of his own desperate youthful efforts to educate himself, came to the Presidency that the vision of Adams became a part of the imagination of Lincoln, and grants of public lands were made to establish our land-grant colleges. I commend to our Republican colleagues the Lincoln tradition.

The action of the Supreme Court invites again the wisdom and vision of John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln. Like a lost Atlantis rising from the sea, modern technology has created, from a source of which we had never dreamed, new public lands in the newly extractable oil deposits lying beneath the sea. We are given a second chance to endow American education from our public

lands after we have wasted far too much of our first chance.

The amendment which we jointly sponsor asks the Congress to realize how vast is this opportunity and responsibility. It is the big chance belonging to the whole Nation rather than a chance for only three or four States. No Senator from any State of the Union fails to realize the crisis in our American educational system and how aware of that crisis his youthful constituents are. No Senator is unaware of the increase in the birth rate in this country. The sudden increase in preschool-age and school-age children has placed an unprecedented strain upon our whole educational structure. The parents and the officials of every town, city, and county in all 48 States are immediately and directly concerned at the family level with the solution of this educational problem. It has become so crucial that last fall *Life* magazine, with 25,000,000 copies per issue, devoted an entire issue—the issue of October 16, 1950—to education. It has become so crucial that here in the Capital the Washington Post has increasingly devoted more of its editorial and news space to the question in a series of articles which last week received a national prize for excellence.

Neither parents nor children nor history will forgive any of us if we repeat the error of the Congress which ignored Adams, when modern technology has given us a second chance. We cannot stand in default and lay our failure to inability to understand the significance of this second chance.

In the critical days in which we now live there is one priority—national defense. Other purposes must give way to this priority until this Nation is so well prepared, so strong that the Russian aggressor will not dare to move.

Because this is so self-evident our amendment proposes that, for the present, tidelands money be used for national defense and national security. This shall be only for extraordinarily urgent and essential developments, selected by the Congress, to relieve the taxpayers of that amount of further tax burden. We therefore propose deferring for the present the actual use of this money for educational purposes.

But we must not defer either the dedication of these funds to education or the study of what specific uses for education these funds should be devoted. The National Advisory Council on Grants in Aid of Education provided by this amendment, eight to be selected by the legislative branch and four by the executive branch, should begin now to determine the most pressing of the many needs of education. A most painstaking and detailed examination is required.

There is no choice here between advantages and disadvantages. Every group, every sector of American education has its back against the wall. Our school buildings are overcrowded. The grammar schools of our Nation are in the next 4 years to receive the largest number of children in the history of the United States. Our postwar babies have come of age—school age. This tidal wave of 6-year-olds will soon inundate the

rickety structure of primary education which already is tottering under its present load. Every State in the Union needs grammar-school teachers, needs new grammar-school buildings. And exactly the same thing is true of our high schools.

Our colleges, whether they are State universities, land-grant colleges, or private colleges are in equally severe financial straits. As taxes and inflation cut down endowments and the capacity of alumni to give, as legislatures have trouble raising additional educational funds, the prices for necessary personnel, services, and equipment, for maintenance and repair—all school operating costs—are skyrocketing.

While the sponsors of this amendment look to this asset as a source of help to the primary and secondary school systems, we feel most strongly that it must also be seen as a source, as a Government Rockefeller Foundation or Ford, Guggenheim, or Carnegie Foundation, out of which means can be provided for assistance to higher education and research which is just as desperately needed. Thus will we be able to maintain as a Nation our level of widespread human competence and keep ahead in the complicated technical efficiency upon which our very survival in this turbulent world may depend.

We hope that out of a study by a competent advisory council of 12 men appointed in the manner provided by the amendment some intelligent and equitable way may be found to help relieve the agonizing difficulties of colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools, technological schools, and research institutions, by some techniques such as scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. In this way every child in America, irrespective of the financial circumstances of his parents, gets his chance at the fullest development of his highest abilities for the sake of the usefulness of those abilities to the Nation itself. And he does so without any cost to the taxpayer when we use income on the tidelands capital, given to us without taxes by Providence.

Institutions of higher learning in the United States today are in desperate financial difficulty. I doubt that the average salary of a full professor, not an assistant or associate professor, but one who has arrived at the top of his professional career—reaches \$6,000 a year. Some Members of this body would be surprised to know what has happened to the actual purchasing power of the scholarship endowments of our great universities. That scholarship endowment is the Nation's insurance of the development and the utilization of the genius that may be born in the humblest home.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I should like to conclude with my formal statement before I yield. I shall be very happy to yield later.

Those who served on the old Senate Committee on Education and Labor will feel as I do that improving the salaries

of underpaid professors in colleges or underpaid teachers in primary and secondary schools may well be the most effective way of assuring a sound democratic philosophy for our students—your children and mine.

I have long been particularly interested in the dilemma of the medical schools because my father was a doctor.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks an article which was published in the *New York Times* of Sunday, June 3, 1951. The headlines read: "Lack of Funds Threatening Medical Education of Nation—Financial Crisis Faced by Major Schools, With Research Work Imperiled."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the report of the Public Health Services Committee on medical schools grants and finances has revealed that a minimum of another \$40,000,000 a year is needed at present enrollment levels and even more money is required to expand the physical facilities needed to teach medicine and train the doctors our country needs.

As compared to \$2,000 before World War I, it now costs about \$13,350 to provide a medical education. At that time the tuition fees were \$122 a year and covered 70 percent of the cost; today's tuition fees of around \$550 cover less than 25 percent. To raise the tuition any higher would mean putting the selection of medical students on an economic rather than ability basis. The Nation's 79 approved medical schools now have a combined deficit of \$10,000,000 a year, ranging from as little as \$67 in one school to more than \$1,000,000 in another. This deficit represents about 20 percent of their operating budgets. And what is true of the medical schools is true of our dental schools, our nursing schools, our technological schools, our liberal arts colleges, our whole system of primary and secondary education.

For too long some have looked upon this predicament as something about which we could do nothing. We have felt perhaps that our ambitions for our children were simply bigger than our capacity to meet them. But with this new Atlantis which Providence and science have given us from the bottom of the sea, we can now reach for our dream.

The need—the future of our children—is great. The means that has been put in our hands with which to meet that need is great. So let us think greatly and act greatly. We must not lose this opportunity. There is enough to go around if we use our assets wisely and far-sightedly. It will do this Nation little good in meeting its problems of tomorrow if the children of Louisiana and California are well educated from oil when their brothers and sisters from Alabama and Oregon, who must stand beside them in working out the problems of their generation, are not equally well educated, and only because they were not lucky enough to be born adjacent to the

oil that belongs to the United States of America.

In this era of vast tides of migration from State to State, we must remember that there is no point in any particular State trying to make itself an insulated community concerned only for the education of the children who live within its own borders at a given moment. It is safe to say that many citizens of the Texas of today received their education in other States and at the expense of the taxpayers of other States. The huge influx of our people into California means that they were educated in a large part at the expense of and according to the standards of other States before they arrived. And when Louisiana really begins to make her own oil and gas hum in the Texas manner, she will become a migrant's El Dorado too. With the increasing problems of defense production, with the insistence that for security purposes such production take place behind our mountain States, it is not inconceivable that the nomadic movements of our people which were so apparent during World War II may again take place. In short, education and the fair sharing of resources for education, is a national as well as a State problem.

We who sponsor this amendment not only hope that our colleagues in the Senate will see the possibilities of good for the Nation in our proposal but we also dare to hope that there are businessmen in the great oil companies who will see these possibilities and deserve the accolade of business statesmen. Some of the biggest businessmen in our business world are in this industry. With the tremors that are communicating themselves from Iran to the whole world of oil, we hope those business statesmen may see in our proposal honest advantages of good will to the world of oil.

This is an opportunity to extend the public appreciation of the work of the Rockefeller Foundation; to identify big oil—in the minds of the rising generation that will shape public opinion and run the Government of this country long after we are gone—as the benefactor on a great national scale of educational opportunity which is the one common denominator of youth's ambition.

This is a business statesman's opportunity to have all the people of this country regard the oil industry as a friend as well as a great national resource, as a friend of every child educated in every State, as a friend of every parent of every child, rather than only the accumulator of tax-favored opportunities for a few.

I suggest to the business statesmen of big oil that in our proposal they may find a happy insurance policy which will guarantee that the attitude of the people of Iran toward oil will never—in the worst hardship or the worst depression—be the attitude of the people of the United States.

This is a chance for the statesmen of big oil—and I am sure they exist—to range themselves wholeheartedly on the side of the angels for the greatest good of the greatest number. This is oil's second chance as well as education's sec-

ond chance and our children's second chance.

I hope big oil is big enough to have the wisdom to see the bigness of this chance for everybody.

EXHIBIT 1

LACK OF FUNDS THREATENING MEDICAL EDUCATION OF NATION—FINANCIAL CRISIS FACED BY MAJOR SCHOOLS, WITH RESEARCH WORK IMPERILED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

A recent reader survey by a national magazine showed medical news ranking with sex and self-improvement as leading subject of interest to the public. Usually such news concerns scientific developments, new drugs, and new treatments that offer hope of curing some disease.

Within the last few weeks, however, there have been a number of big medical news stories that have dealt with something much more fundamental—the financial crisis in American medical schools.

The first of these was the report of the Public Health Service's Committee on Medical School Grants and Finances headed by Dr. Lowell J. Reed, Johns Hopkins University. In this detailed study on the financial and related problems in medical education and research, it was brought out that "a minimum of another \$40,000,000 a year is needed to cover the medical schools' operating expenses at present enrollment levels" and "even more money is required to expand the physical facilities needed to teach medicine."

The costs of medical education during the last 50 years have increased tremendously. As compared to \$2,000 before World War I, it now costs about \$13,350 to provide undergraduate medical training. At that time, the tuition fees of \$122 a year covered 70 percent of the cost; today's tuition fees of around \$550 cover less than 25 percent. To raise the tuition any higher would mean putting the selection of medical students on an economic rather than ability basis.

SCHOOLS FACE VAST DEFICITS

With rising costs, schools have less income from their endowments, because of lowered yield on investments, and less support from individual philanthropists, because of the increasing tax burden. The result is that the Nation's 79 approved medical schools now have a combined deficit of \$10,000,000 a year, ranging from as little as \$87 in one school to more than \$1,000,000 in another. This deficit represents about 20 percent of their operating budgets.

The urgency of this problem has been emphasized recently in the report of the commission on financing higher education, established by the Association of American Universities and financed by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp. This commission, consisting of six college presidents and six industrial leaders, noted the necessity for financial aid, but it went on record as opposing Federal aid to medical education, saying, "Until it has been clearly demonstrated that other sources of support cannot finance medical education, we believe no such great and potentially far-reaching innovation in Federal financing should be undertaken."

Instead they suggested:

1. More economies in medical schools.
2. Financing hospital care and other community services now provided by medical schools from local government appropriations for welfare purposes.
3. The payment of the full cost of such research by foundations, corporations, and other agencies supporting medical research.
4. Increased State appropriations, but not at the expense of other State-supported programs of higher education.
5. An increase in gift income.

Although laudable, the commission's proposals are not easy to achieve. As Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, said the day after the commission's report: "If by economies they mean cutting budgets, of course, they can. If, however, by economies you mean saving money and doing an equally good job, I submit they are mistaken. * * * We are economizing and are paying a heavy price in not producing as many and the kind of doctors we should to take advantage of the great scientific discoveries of the century."

INADEQUACY OF PAY CITED

There is certainly one area in which further economy is not possible, and that is in the salaries of medical-school teachers. Although they are the foundation of medical education and must have years of training, most of our basic-science teachers in medical schools earn far less than journeymen. For example, one of the leading teachers of physiology in medicine today, an associate professor with a doctoral degree and 25 years of teaching experience, makes but \$7,200 a year. Many excellent young research men with as much as 10 years of experience are earning less than \$5,000.

It is readily apparent that our medical schools must have more funds and that these funds can come only from the Federal Government or from voluntary sources. Bills for Federal support of medical education have been introduced in each of the last several Congresses. The Association of American Medical Colleges and other groups have favored such legislation, but the American Medical Association has been opposed, fearing that Federal support might lead to Federal control. As an alternative the AMA has formed the American Medical Education Foundation to receive and distribute voluntary contributions to aid medical schools and it has suggested that each physician in the Nation give \$100 annually. If this goal were achieved, it would mean nearly \$18,000,000 a year in new income to our medical schools.

The AMA has merged its fund with the recently announced National Fund for Medical Education in which it is hoped that \$5,000,000 can be raised annually from private sources for distribution to medical schools. The new fund, which has the sponsorship of industry, the medical profession, organized labor, agriculture, and a group of university presidents and 12 scientific and educational foundations, has thus far raised \$1,000,000 from contributions by the medical profession and such other groups as 18 leading life-insurance companies and many industrial corporations.

An ambitious but extremely important project, the National Fund for Medical Education is a step in the right direction even if it solves only a part of the problem. Certainly, as Herbert Hoover, its honorary chairman, has said, it is a "significant development in the strengthening of the Nation's medical manpower."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] I submit the amendment, to be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be

received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNING in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate Executive I, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a protocol dated August 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and the protocol, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol dated in London, August 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1950, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar signed at London on May 6, 1937.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Under Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 7, 1951.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Under Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of protocol of August 31, 1950.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there be none, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joe Warren Sheehy, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. I now ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 7 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

IN THE NAVY

Alan G. Lewis (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name. Richard Y. Kelly (civilian college graduate) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy: Rosemary D. Arenth Betty R. Kunzman Kathleen D. Beck Diana McNair Marlon C. Brenner Bertha S. Miller Emily J. Byrd Mary V. Moore Nancy J. Chapman Faye P. Overton Shirley J. Clare Frances MacD. Patch Mary T. Connors Bette J. Pickett Yvonne C. Mary-Jeanette M. Rayner Fossenkemper Louise B. Rogerson Nellie M. Grieve Agnes I. Rupp Louise E. Griffin Mary E. Sheffels Elizabeth Hart Suzanne S. Shera George Hodges Margaret F. Smith Mitzie L. Jacobson Ann Thompson Ethel R. Klein Ruth V. Whitfield Sibyl L. Kuhnle

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Elizabeth L. Childers
Clair Cook

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Rufus J. Pearson, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert H. Palmer, Jr. Roger P. Smitley
Clifford C. Roosa James N. Waggoner

Fitzhugh N. Hamrick to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Belva L. Coole Rachel A. Nantz
Winifred L. Copeland Virginia Marfia
June M. Elssesser Margaret E. Nix
Evelyn C. Foht Mary L. O'Donnell
Susan M. Hanley Elizabeth Pope
Mary H. Harris Julia E. Scarcello
Viola M. Hofer Dorothy J. Shields
Regina M. Holland Iris M. Stock
Wanda J. Humphrey Mary T. Taylor
Barbara J. Hundley Annie R. White
Dorothy V. Krause

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only:

ENSIGNS

Albert Antar	Peter E. Moll, Jr.
Harold S. Birdsong	Robert L. Moore
Arthur A. Bish	Aulcey D. Mosley
Donald "D" Butler	Sylvester F. North
John J. Bramblett, Jr.	James P. Padgett
Francis E. Carnicom	John K. Pegues, Jr.
John T. Childs	Robert Pescott
Earl D. Christensen	Everett R. Peugh
John H. Church	Lloyd G. Peterson, Jr.
Ernest L. Cobern	Robert E. Pierce
James E. Criner	Joseph E. Pinning
Peter DellaRocca	Harry B. Pitcher, Jr.
Frank Dievendoff	Wilbur P. Powers
Charles A. Dodd	Walter A. Ramsey
Philip M. Dyer	Garlin R. Read
Otis E. Engelman	Irvin W. Reed
George J. Evans	Albert R. Reid
Julius E. Fuchs	Benjamin G. Sailors
Adolph J. Furtek	William G. Sandberg
Robert D. Gale	Albert G. Sentman
Bernard H. Garrett	Elroy J. Shafer
Homer A. Giddens	George T. Sinclair, Jr.
Herman E. Goebel, Jr.	Jack D. Smith
William L. Halleck	George Stenke
Theodore P. Henrikson	Joseph St. Marie
James "B" Hobbs	Preston G. Thomas
John C. Hounihan	Ted K. Tillotson
Donnie W. Huckaby	William O. Thomson
William L. Hutton	Jackson M. Tomskey
Jack R. Ingram	Mike J. Trems
Robert G. Jacks	John C. Valek
Cecil King	William McK. Villines, Jr.
Everett N. Leach	Willard F. Waterfield, Jr.
William R. Leibold	Arthur C. White
John D. Lewallen	George W. Whitman
Joe J. Lillienfeld	Raymond O. Wilkinson
Eugene J. McGuire	William R. Yarwood
George W. Macauley	
Armando E. Mancini	
Richard E. Mikkelsen	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only:

ENSIGNS

Donavon E. Abraham Lowell A. Reade
Charles H. McKenzie Clarence E. Reed
George W. Nelson

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only:

ENSIGNS

David H. Bodtke
Robert A. Martin

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 7 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joe Warren Sheehy, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Texas.

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Ross A. Hancher, Elwood.
Claude B. Holder, Hope.
Norman Bretz, Huntingburg.
Paul V. Geiger, Markle.
Frank S. Anderson, Salem.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harper T. Gerry, Shelburne Falls.

MICHIGAN

Lillian M. Dewey, Alden.
Thomas H. Branigan, Auburn.
Charles E. Wesner, Buchanan.
J. Donald Van Sickle, Carson City.
Arthur G. Warlick, Jr., Colon.
Vernon P. McGuire, Detour.
Albert C. Johnston, Palmyra.
John S. Miller, Rapid River.

NEW YORK
John D. Allardice, Hudson.
PENNSYLVANIA
William Lester Davis, Peach Glen.
WASHINGTON
Hugh A. Miller, Granite Falls.
Sanford M. Lord, Kelso.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

Rev. Paul J. Harrell, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, ruler of the universe, remembering Thy commandment "to have no other gods before Thee" and realizing that such priority is right and good, we pledge to Thee our highest allegiance. Keep us true to that pledge that we may be true to ourselves, our work, and our Nation.

Spirit of the Living God, fall fresh upon us. Invade the shore lines of our lives and instead of repulsing Thee with self-sufficiency and pride, as so often we have, we will welcome Thee as the rightful possessor and ruler of our lives.

We know, O God, that no one can improve the world so drastically and speedily as is now needed except Thyself, but we know You will not change it apart from our cooperation. Direct today the President, this body, and all who seek to cooperate with Thee toward that end. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 75. An act authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) entitled "Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. McMAHON, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTESTED ELECTION OF RAYMOND W. KARST v. THOMAS B. CURTIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the Clerk of the House which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on

House Administration and ordered printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1951.
HONORABLE SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: From the contestant in the contested election case of Raymond W. Karst against Thomas B. Curtis for a seat in the Eighty-second Congress from the Twelfth Congressional District of Missouri, I have received a statement including a motion to dismiss his intention to contest the seat of the returned Member in the said district.

This communication is transmitted to the House for reference to the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN HARLEY BURKE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a sad duty to perform, one which I regret occasion requires. It is to announce the passing of a former able Member of this House on May 14, 1951, the late Honorable John Harley Burke, who also resided in my home city of Long Beach during most of his lifetime and represented for one term in this House the same congressional district I now represent, the Eighteenth District of California.

John Harley Burke was born in Excelsior, Wis., June 2, 1894, and moved to Long Beach in 1909. He and I attended the same high school at Long Beach. He attended the University of Santa Clara, Calif., and the law department of the University of Southern California at Los Angeles, with a splendid record. He was admitted to the bar of the State of California in 1917 and commenced promptly law practice in Long Beach, Calif., and established a large law practice.

During the First World War, he served as a private in the Twelfth Training Battery Field Artillery, Camp Taylor, Ky., in 1918.

After he returned to Long Beach from one term in Congress—the Seventy-third session, March 4, 1933, to January 3, 1935—he engaged in the oil business as an independent producer. He was not a candidate for reelection to Congress. He was a life member of the Elks and a member of the American Legion.

I personally knew him from the year 1909. He was recognized as a very able, kindly, generous friend of a large circle of loyal friends. I know his wife and children personally; they are fine folks. She is a lovely and loyal wife. His children are all adults. I am sure that the House joins with me in expressing understanding sympathy to his family and his loved ones. His membership in this Congress was on the Democratic side of the political aisle. I shall always recall with pleasure my teaming up with him

on a speaking team for the support of the Liberty bonds during the First World War. He was a very able and eloquent speaker in support of his position in public debate or in the courtroom. I appreciate your joining with me in extending sympathy to his family at Long Beach.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DOWN PAYMENT ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, from reports I am receiving back home, new and used automobiles are piling up in warehouses and showrooms to the sorrow of the American public who would like to buy them but cannot.

There are plenty of willing purchasers but they just cannot save the necessary one-third down payment.

It is evident that the automobile industry, one of the Nation's greatest enterprises, is suffering as the direct result of the Government's stringent credit regulations.

Frankly, I do not feel such rulings are necessary. They simply prevent citizens who need cars from acquiring them.

All Americans who have jobs and families should have cars. Our defense program depends to a large extent upon how mobile the masses of our people can become.

Private ownership of automobiles has become a necessity, since populations should be dispersing in all directions from the large cities. There will be far less hardship and devastation to humanity if people can live distances from plants and factories within the cities and commute by their own cars.

As it is now, however, hundreds of thousands of workers and farmers find they are not in reach of owning automobiles because the ready cash they may have saved has gone to pay inflated food prices or to meet some family emergency.

They are not even able to raise a modest sum for a down payment on a car. They could arrange for the regular monthly outlay, but are precluded from the first step in car purchasing because the requirement in the initial step is beyond them.

I believe the time has come to remove credit restrictions on the purchase of automobiles in order to give everybody a chance to own one.

Therefore I am introducing a bill authorizing the right of any citizen to purchase a new or used car simply by paying a dollar down.

This easing of regulations should break the log jam of surplus cars piling up for lack of purchasers. This will

save the automobile business, and accelerate our whole national preparedness program. It will keep the public on wheels and assure victory for America.

The Hall bill reads as follows:

A bill to enable all Americans to purchase automobiles by eliminating down payments of more than \$1

Whereas there is a tremendous surplus of new and used automobiles which are causing an ever-increasing glut on the market; and

Whereas these automobiles should be made available to American citizens for purchase and use; and

Whereas credit regulations are now so stringent that the majority of people find it impossible to make initial payments which will give them title to automobiles; and

Whereas business will be stimulated and revived in one of the most important American industries if credit restrictions are lifted; and

Whereas the whole country will profit immensely by greatly increased purchases therefrom: Therefore

Be it enacted that the Senate of the United States and House of Representatives in Congress assembled do hereby order, That—

1. Credit restrictions governing the purchase of new and used automobiles by American citizens be lifted to the extent that no purchasers of said automobiles need make a down payment of more than \$1.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Did the gentleman vote for the price-control bill when it was passed?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not remember.

UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, on June 5 on the floor of this House I charged that the so-called price war engaged in by various department stores all over the country was conclusive proof that the prices maintained heretofore by these organizations were entirely too high. I further charged that by maintaining these unfair prices that the stores had been overcharging and gouging the public for years.

This morning's New York Times carries an article, Answer to O'TOOLE Issued by Gimbel. Mr. Gimbel in his statement says that the price war does not prove that the retail prices have been too high. Without specifying any particular articles he said that many items are now being sold in this war below cost. If this is so, Mr. Gimbel, is it not a fact that you and those whom you accuse of being guilty of this practice are engaged in unfair competition? You confess to and indict other members of your industry in engaging in practices that can do nothing but lead to the ruin of many of the small retailers in our Nation.

With the great cash resources that the big stores have, with the secret rebates

and kick-backs that the big store receives from the manufacturer and middleman, with the immense amount of money that the larger groups have for advertising, it is impossible for the smaller man to compete with you and stay in business. Mr. Gimbel's answer is a further indication that there is an absolute need for the investigation that I have asked for of the entire price set-up for meats, foods, clothing, and all household necessities. If, as Mr. Gimbel suggests, the large stores are now selling some items under cost, I believe that the Attorney General of the United States and of the various States should take cognizance of the fact and take action to prevent these unethical and unfair trade practices.

From information that I have at my command, I definitely know that the great majority of the articles that have been reduced in this price war are still being sold by the large stores at a profit. At no point in his statement did Mr. Gimbel deny this fact. This is an implied admission that the 30 to 60 percent profits that were made on specified articles in the past were unfair profits.

BROOKLYN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, truly the light should shine not when the world is at peace but rather in days like this. Today in Brooklyn a light does shine, for there we celebrate the one hundred and twenty-second anniversary of the founding of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union, and today in Brooklyn upward of 100,000 men, women, and children of all Protestant sects will proudly march in a public display of their allegiance to that light; a singular, historic day in Brooklyn that the world might well contemplate and emulate.

STOP MEAT INDUSTRY'S STRIKE AGAINST CONTROLS

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked and appalled by the statements made by the representatives of the cattlemen and others that make up the meat industry, who appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member. They have threatened the return of the black market if controls are established and prices rolled back.

I am sick and tired of this talk. How long are we to be dictated to by individuals who are interested in unconscionable profits rather than in the welfare of their country? There would have been no black market during World War II had they been anxious to obey the law by

policing their own industry. Their greed for wealth cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars.

We are now threatened again with a black market unless we obey their orders. They are not afraid of monetary punishment, or yes, even criminal punishment, because in the past, scapegoats were found to take the criminal punishment intended for those responsible for the wrongs.

We are in a period of great emergency and must find a way to make the greedy respect and obey the laws of our country. Labor was forced to cooperate in the past when the railroads were seized and operated by the Government in the interest of our common welfare. Why cannot the same reasoning be used today to assure the people of this country of an adequate supply of food?

I, therefore, advocate that just as soon as a black market appears in the meat industry or any other industry dealing in essentials which so vitally affect the well-being of our people, or there is a deliberate curtailment in the production of such essential items so that they do not appear in the markets in normal quantities for all to purchase at fair prices as prescribed by the Office of Price Stabilization—the United States Government should seize and operate such industry in its entirety. In this way the producers and all those in the allied fields would be assured of a fair price and the consumer would not be subjected to the vicious practices of black markets.

I know that what I advocate is drastic, but drastic remedies are needed to meet such threats. Why should we permit criminals and racketeers, who deal in black markets, to gain control of our country?

I shall offer the necessary amendments to the Defense Production Act which will provide authority for such seizures.

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES WILLOUGHBY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention, through various news publications, that a certain Richard Sorge, who was executed by the Japanese in the latter part of World War II as a Communist spy, had in his possession a list of names which would indicate that certain Americans were engaged in espionage activities in the Far East. It is my further understanding that Maj. Gen. Charles Willoughby, Chief of Army Intelligence under General MacArthur in Japan, has this list of names and that, as yet, it has not been made public. General Willoughby is now in this country and I am therefore requesting the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee or the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to call General Willoughby before it to inquire into the names contained in this list and to lay that information before the membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Why not have the Committee on Armed Services look into it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned, all I want is to have a congressional committee look into this and find out what the story is.

Mr. RANKIN. I think that committee should investigate it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. General Willoughby has already been subpoenaed by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Montana has said, General Willoughby is now in this country. The Sorge spy matter is one with which he is most familiar—more familiar than any other person. He has tried for years to get somebody to listen to him on this matter which affected the security of the United States. His efforts to secure attention from the Defense Department and from the State Department have certainly been continually ignored. Why? Because, I think, General Willoughby is a very well-known anti-Communist and because General Willoughby has pled for the disclosure of important matters affecting the security of the United States. The State Department has never been interested in charges made by anti-Communists, for fear that such unseemly interest might make the Russians "mad," and the only way in which this matter can be developed is through the proper committee of the House of Representatives. I hope General Willoughby will be called on soon and heard at length. There is a lot he can tell you about State Department skullduggery in the Asian area, if your committee really wants to get at the truth. Of course, Dean Acheson will deny everything, but some day when our State Department has been cleansed of its Achesons, its Communist-lovers, its appeasers, and a new Secretary installed who favors the "big truth" as against the "big lie" as an instrument of national policy, we may then have a foreign policy Americans can support and the world can respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

CATTLE FEEDER SITUATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER] call the cattlemen and cattle feeders of the Midwest greedy. When we see that on yesterday Eric Johnston permitted automobile workers to receive a raise in an additional 4 cents an hour for so-called production incentive, it comes with very poor grace indeed for anybody on the administration side to call our farmers and cattlemen, especially when that same administration is determined to roll back the receipts of these same cattle feeders, from 10 percent to 19 percent. I repeat, I regret that we hear on the floor of the House any such statements about the cattlemen of the Midwest being greedy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this beef-cattle problem. I am in full accord with the sentiments expressed by my colleague from Minnesota, Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN. While home last week I talked with my cousin who lives on a farm and who makes a specialty of feeding cattle. He raises corn and feeds it to cattle. He buys steers. He has 40 steers now fattening. He paid \$32 a hundredweight for those steers and it costs him between five and six dollars per hundredweight to fatten them. He says he is going to lose—actually lose \$1,800 to \$2,000 on those 40 steers. He says, "Noah, do you think I am going to buy any more steers and fatten them at a loss? I am forced to take my loss on these steers, but I cannot be forced to take any more losses. I shall quit fattening cattle." That is what the steer-fattening groups are up against. So there is another side to this cattle-feeding problem than the one presented by the gentleman from New York.

PETER E. KOLESNIKOFF

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2918) for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$766."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MATTIE MASHAW

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 652) for

the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,249.45" and insert "\$6,244."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1944" and insert "1942."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to know if the gentleman has consulted the chairman of the committee on this proposition.

Mr. KEATING. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. RANKIN. The chairman of the committee that handled it.

Mr. KEATING. It is the chairman of the committee that handled it at whose request I am presenting the bill; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Who is the gentleman on this side of the aisle who is in charge of it?

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] is chairman of the committee and has requested me to present this matter to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRICE FIXING ON FOOD COMMODITIES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] gets up here and accuses, as he usually does, people who are trying to better the living conditions of the people of this country, of being Communists. Every time we try to do something constructive he calls it communism.

When we had TVA, that was not communism. When we try to help the consumers of this country, when we try to keep prices down, when we try to have rent control, the gentleman comes up with that eternal cry of "communism." He cannot have any constructive opposition. He therefore resorts to name calling. It is the old case of the boy crying, "Wolf, wolf" so often that nobody paid attention to him. That is the effect that the gentleman from Mississippi is having upon us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and

security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

Angell	Gwinn	Moulder
Blatnik	Harrison, Wyo.	Murray, Wis.
Boggs, La.	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Konski
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Poage
Byrne, N. Y.	Jones, Mo.	Poulson
Carnahan	Kearns	Powell
Cox	Kelley, Pa.	Preston
Crawford	Kennedy	Rabaut
Curtis, Nebr.	Kilburn	Reed, Ill.
Dawson	Kilday	Sabath
Dingell	LeCompte	Sheehan
Durham	Lyle	Shelley
Evins	McCarthy	Smith, Kans.
Flood	Merrow	Stanley
Fugate	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Gillette	Miller, N. Y.	Winstead
Gossett	Morton	Wood, Ga.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 535)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I

"SECTION 1. The Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, is further amended as follows:

"(a) Section 1 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the "Universal Military Training and Service Act."

"(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorized active-duty personnel strength of the armed forces, exclusive of personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, officer candidates, personnel of the armed forces employed in the Selective Service System, and persons paid under the appropriations for the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, is hereby established as follows: (1) Of the Army of the United States, eight hundred thirty-seven thousand; (2) of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the present authorized statutory strength of six hundred sixty-six thousand, eight hundred and eighty-two; and (3) of the Air Force of the United States, five hundred two thousand. The strength herein established for each of the armed forces shall mean the daily average number of persons on active duty therein during the fiscal year."

"(c) Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Except as otherwise provided in this title, it shall be the duty of every male citizen of the United States, and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States, who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration, is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, to present himself for and submit to registration at such time or times and place or places, and in such manner, as shall be determined by proclamation of the President and by rules and regulations prescribed hereunder."

"(d) Section 4 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States and every male alien admitted for permanent residence, who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for his registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States: *Provided*, That each registrant shall be immediately liable for classification and examination, and shall, as soon as practicable following his registration, be so classified and examined, both physically and mentally, in order to determine his availability for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces: *Provided further*, That any male alien who is between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years, at the time fixed for registration, or who attains the age of 18 years and 6 months after having been required to register pursuant to section 3 of this title, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, who has remained in the United States in a status other than that of a permanent resident for a period exceeding one year (other than an alien exempted from registration under this title and regulations prescribed thereunder) shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States, except that any such alien shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the Armed Forces he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the Armed Forces of the United States for training and service in the manner provided in this title (including but not limited to selec-

tion and induction by age group or age groups) such number of persons as may be required to provide and maintain the strength of the Armed Forces.

"At such time as the period of active service in the Armed Forces required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (k) of this title, and except as otherwise provided in this title, every male citizen of the United States who is required to register under this title and who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, and every male alien admitted for permanent residence who is required to register under this title and who has not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, shall be liable for training in the National Security Training Corps: *Provided*, That any male alien who is required to register under the provisions of this title and who has not reached the nineteenth anniversary of the date of his birth on the date such period of active service is reduced or eliminated, or who is otherwise liable as provided in section 6 (h) of this title, who has remained in the United States in a status other than that of a permanent resident for a period exceeding one year shall be liable for training in the National Security Training Corps except that any such alien shall be relieved from such training under this title if, prior to his induction into the National Security Training Corps he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President, but any alien who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That persons deferred under the provisions of section 6 of this title shall not be relieved from liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps solely by reason of having exceeded the age of 19 years during the period of such deferment. The President is authorized, from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct for training in the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter provided such number of persons as may be required to further the purposes of this title.

"No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service or shall be inducted for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title until his acceptability in all respects, including his physical and mental fitness, has been satisfactorily determined under standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense: *Provided*, That the minimum standards for physical acceptability established pursuant to this subsection shall not be higher than those applied to persons inducted between the ages of 18 and 26 in January 1945: *Provided further*, That the passing requirement for the Armed Forces Qualification Test shall be fixed at a percentile score of 10 points.

"No persons shall be inducted for such training and service until adequate provision shall have been made for such shelter, sanitary facilities, water supplies, heating and lighting arrangements, medical care, and hospital accommodations for such persons as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury to be essential to the public and personal health.

"The persons inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service under this title shall be assigned to stations or units of such forces. Persons inducted into the land

forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Army of the United States; persons inducted into the naval forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps or the United States Coast Guard, as appropriate; and persons inducted into the air forces of the United States pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be members of the Air Force of the United States.

"Every person inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to the authority of this subsection after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall, following his induction, be given full and adequate military training for service in the armed force into which he is inducted for a period of not less than four months, and no such person shall, during this four months' period, be assigned for duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone); and no other member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is enlisted, inducted, appointed, or ordered to active duty after the date of enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act shall be assigned to duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories and possessions (including the Canal Zone), until he has had the equivalent of at least four months of basic training: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated by the Congress shall be used for the purpose of transporting or maintaining in violation of the provisions of this paragraph any person inducted into, or enlisted, appointed or ordered to active duty in, the Armed Forces under the provisions of this title.

"No person, without his consent, shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under this title, except as otherwise provided herein, after he has attained the twenty-sixth anniversary of the day of his birth.

"No member of the Armed Forces shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States."

"(e) Section 4 (b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each person inducted into the Armed Forces under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall serve on active training and service for a period of twenty-four consecutive months, unless sooner released, transferred, or discharged in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) or as otherwise prescribed by subsection (d) of section 4 of this title."

"(f) Section 4 (c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) Under the provisions of applicable laws and regulations any person between the ages of eighteen years and six months and twenty-six years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the regular army for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, any person so enlisting shall not have his enlistment extended without his consent until after a declaration of war or national emergency by the Congress after the date of enactment of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"(2) Any enlisted member of any reserve component of the Armed Forces may, during

the effective period of this Act, apply for a period of service equal to that prescribed in subsection (b) of this section and his application shall be accepted: *Provided*, That his services can be effectively utilized and that his physical and mental fitness for such service meet the standards prescribed by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That active service performed pursuant to this section shall not prejudice his status as such member of such reserve component: *And provided further*, That any person who was a member of a reserve component on June 25, 1950, and who thereafter continued to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component, shall, if his application for active duty made pursuant to this paragraph is denied, be deferred from induction under this title until such time as he is ordered to active duty or ceases to serve satisfactorily in such reserve component.

"(3) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, shall be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b), but no person who so volunteers shall be inducted for such training and service so long as he is deferred after classification.

"(4) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the Armed Forces of the United States for the training and service prescribed in subsection (b).

"(5) Within the limits of the quota determined under section 5 (b) for the subdivision in which he resides, at such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized pursuant to the provisions of this title, any person after attaining the age of seventeen shall with the written consent of his parents or guardian be afforded an opportunity to volunteer for induction into the National Security Training Corps for the training prescribed in subsection (k) of section 4 of this title."

"(g) Section 4 (d) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word 'hereafter', where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection, the words 'and prior to the enactment of the 1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act', and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Each person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component, for a total period of eight years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard). Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component during such period. In case the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect

to the United States Coast Guard), determines that enlistment, enrollment, or appointment in, or assignment to, an organized unit of a reserve component or an officers' training program of the armed force in which he served is available to, and can, without undue personal hardship, be filled by any such person, it shall be the duty of such person to enlist, enroll, or accept appointment in, or accept assignment to, such organized unit or officers' training program, and to serve satisfactorily therein. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), may provide, by regulations which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, for the release from training and service in the Armed Forces prior to serving the periods required by subsection (b) of this section of individuals who volunteer for and are accepted into organized units of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard and other reserve components. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force."

"(h) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 4 of such Act are repealed.

"(i) Paragraph (1) of section 4 (1) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting after the word 'subsections' the following: '6 (g),' and (2) by striking out 'twenty-one' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-four'."

"(j) Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(k) (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

"(2) Whenever the Congress shall by concurrent resolution declare—

"(A) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be decreased to any period less than twenty-four months which may be designated in such resolution; or

"(B) that the period of active service required of any age group or groups of persons inducted under this title should be eliminated, the period of active service in the Armed Forces of the age group or groups designated in any such resolution shall be so decreased or eliminated, as the case may be. Whenever the period of active service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or as a result of the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, all individuals then or thereafter liable for registration under this title who on that date have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth and have not been inducted into the Armed Forces shall be liable, effective on such date, for induction into the National Security Training Corps as hereinafter established for initial military training for a period of six months.

"(3) There is hereby established a National Security Training Commission (hereinafter called the Commission), which shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular

components of any of the Armed Forces. Of the three civilian members, not more than two shall be of the same political party. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted. At such time as the Commission shall be appointed, in accordance with this paragraph, there shall be established a National Security Training Corps.

"(4) The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be five years, except that (A) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of two years, one at the end of three years, one at the end of four years, and one at the end of five years, after the date of enactment of this paragraph; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Members of the Commission, other than active members of the Regular components of the Armed Forces, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed \$50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of \$9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

"(5) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. The Commission shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense shall designate the military departments to carry out such training. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission. The military department or departments so designated to carry out such military training shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the National Security Training Corps.

"(6) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"(7) Not later than four months following confirmation of the members of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to—

"(A) a broad outline for a program deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to assure that the training carried out under the provisions of this Act shall be of a military nature, but nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to grant to the Commission the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(B) measures for the personal safety, health, welfare and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps;

"(C) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof;

"(D) measures deemed necessary to implement the policies and standards established under the provisions of paragraph (5) of this subsection; and

"(E) disability and death benefits and other benefits, and the obligations, duties, liabilities, and responsibilities, to be granted to or imposed upon members of the National Security Training Corps.

All legislative recommendations submitted under this paragraph shall be referred to the Committees on Armed Services of the two Houses, and each of such committees shall, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of the Congress, following the date on which the recommendations provided for in this paragraph are transmitted to the Congress, report thereon to its House: *Provided*, That any bill or resolution reported with respect to such recommendations shall be privileged and may be called up by any member of either House but shall be subject to amendment as if it were not so privileged.

"(8) No person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after—

"(A) a code of conduct, together with penalties for violation thereof, and measures providing for disability and death benefits have been enacted into law; and

"(B) such other legislative recommendations as are provided for in paragraph (7) shall have been considered and such recommendations or any portion thereof shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law; and

"(C) the period of service required under this title of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or as a result of the adoption of a concurrent resolution of the Congress in accordance with paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(9) Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semi-annually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a list of camps and stations at which training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding six months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding six months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.

"(10) Each person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be compensated at the monthly rate of \$30: *Provided, however*, That each such person, having a dependent or dependents as such terms are defined in the Career Compensation Act of 1949, shall be entitled to receive a dependency allowance equal to the sum of the basic allowance for quarters provided for persons in pay grade E-1 by section 302 (f) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by section 3 of the Dependents' Assistance Act of 1950 as may be extended or amended

plus \$40 so long as such person has in effect an allotment equal to the amount of such dependency allowance for the support of the dependent or dependents on whose account the allowance is claimed.

"(11) No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be assigned for training at an installation located on land outside the continental United States, except that residents of Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.

"(k) Section 5 (a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: '*And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prohibit the selection or induction of persons by age group or groups under rules and regulations prescribed by the President: *And provided further*, That—

"(1) no local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of nineteen unless there is not within the jurisdiction of such local board a sufficient number of persons who are deemed by such local board to be available for induction and who have attained the age of nineteen to enable such local board to meet a call for men which it has been ordered to furnish for induction; and

"(2) no local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of nineteen, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such local board who (i) is as much as ninety days older, (ii) has not attained the age of nineteen, and (iii) is deemed by the local board to be available for induction.'

"(l) Section 6 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Commissioned officers, warrant officers, pay clerks, enlisted men, and aviation cadets of the Regular Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Public Health Service; cadets, United States Military Academy; midshipmen, United States Navy; cadets, United States Coast Guard Academy; midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserves; students enrolled in an officer procurement program at military colleges the curriculum of which is approved by the Secretary of Defense; members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, while on active duty; and foreign diplomatic representatives, technical attachés of foreign embassies and legations, consuls general, consuls, vice consuls and other consular agents of foreign countries who are not citizens of the United States, and members of their families, and persons in other categories to be specified by the President who are not citizens of the United States, shall not be required to be registered under section 3 and shall be relieved from liability for training and service under section 4, except that aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall not be so exempted.'

"(m) (1) Section 6 (c) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out 'the effective date of this title,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 1, 1951.'

"(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words 'six months' a comma and the words 'prior to the determination by the Secretary of Defense that adequate trained personnel are available to the National Guard to enable it to maintain its strength authorized by current appropriations, and prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction.'

"(3) Section 6 (c) (2) (B) of such Act is amended by inserting after 'subsection (b)'

a comma and the following: 'paragraph (1) of this subsection.'

"(n) Section 6 (d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, any person who (A) has been or may hereafter be selected for enrollment or continuance in the senior division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or the naval and Marine Corps officer candidates training program established by the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, or the Reserve officers' candidate program of the Navy, or the platoon leaders' class of the Marine Corps, or the officer procurement programs of the Coast Guard and the Coast Guard Reserve, or appointed an ensign, United States Naval Reserve, while undergoing professional training; (B) agrees, in writing, to accept a commission, if tendered, and to serve, subject to order of the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over him (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard), not less than two years on active duty after receipt of a commission; and (C) agrees to remain a member of a regular or reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of a commission in accordance with his obligation under subsection (d) of section 4 of this title, shall be deferred from induction under this title until after completion or termination of the course of instruction and so long as he continues in a regular or reserve status upon being commissioned, but shall not be exempt from registration. Such persons, except those persons who have previously completed an initial period of military training or an equivalent period of active military training and service, shall be required while enrolled in such programs to complete a period of training equal (as determined under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) in duration and type of training to an initial period of military training. There shall be added to the obligated active commissioned service of any person who has agreed to perform such obligatory service in return for financial assistance while attending a civilian college under any such training program a period of not to exceed one year.

"(2) In addition to the training programs enumerated in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the United States Coast Guard) may approve, the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to establish officer candidate programs leading to the commissioning of persons on active duty.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

"(c) Section 6 (h) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an Office (other than an Office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chi-

ropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone, except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States or undergoing training in the National Security Training Corps shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government."

"(p) Section 6 (1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any person who is satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a high school or similar institution of learning shall, upon the facts being pre-

sented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the time of his graduation therefrom, or (B) until he attains the twentieth anniversary of his birth, or (C) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earliest.

"(2) Any person who while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution is ordered to report for induction under this title, shall, upon the facts being presented to the local board, be deferred (A) until the end of such academic year, or (B) until he ceases satisfactorily to pursue such course of instruction, whichever is the earlier: *Provided*, That any person who has heretofore had his induction postponed under the provisions of section 6 (1) (2) of the Selective Service Act of 1948; or any person who has heretofore been deferred as a student under section 6 (h) of such Act; or any person who hereafter is deferred under the provision of this subsection, shall not be further deferred by reason of pursuit of a course of instruction at a college, university, or similar institution of learning except as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the President pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h) of this section. Nothing in this paragraph shall be deemed to preclude the President from providing, by regulations prescribed under subsection (h) of this section, for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any category or categories of students for such periods of time as he may deem appropriate."

"(q) Section 6 (j) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words 'be deferred' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'in lieu of such induction, be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4 (b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title', and (2) by striking out in the seventh sentence thereof the words 'he shall be deferred' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'he shall in lieu of such induction be ordered by his local board, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe, to perform for a period equal to the period prescribed in section 4 (b) such civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest as the local board may deem appropriate and any such person who knowingly fails or neglects to obey any such order from his local board shall be deemed, for the purposes of section 12 of this title, to have knowingly failed or neglected to perform a duty required of him under this title'.

"(r) Section 7 of such Act is repealed.

"(s) Section 9 (g) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) (1) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States (other than in a reserve component) and who serves for not more than four years (plus any period of additional service imposed pursuant to law) shall be entitled upon release from service under honorable conditions to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided for by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title.

"(2) Any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, enters upon active duty (other than for the purpose of determining his physical fitness), whether or not voluntarily, in the Armed Forces of the United States or

the Public Health Service in response to an order or call to active duty shall, upon his relief from active duty under honorable conditions, be entitled to all of the reemployment rights and benefits provided by this section in the case of persons inducted under the provisions of this title, if he is relieved from active duty not later than four years after the date of entering upon active duty or as soon after the expiration of such four years as he is able to obtain orders relieving him from active duty.

"(3) Any employee who holds a position described in paragraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b) of this section shall be granted a leave of absence by his employer for the purpose of being inducted into, entering, determining his physical fitness to enter, or performing training duty in, the Armed Forces of the United States. Upon his release from training duty or upon his rejection, such employee shall, if he makes application for reinstatement within thirty days following his release, be reinstated in his position without reduction in his seniority, status, or pay except as such reduction may be made for all employees similarly situated."

"(t) Section 13 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Nothing in sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C. title 5, sec. 99), or in the second sentence of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Act of August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1148), entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities', as amended, shall be deemed to apply to any person because of his appointment under authority of this title or the regulations made pursuant thereto as an uncompensated official of the Selective Service System, or as an individual to conduct hearings on appeals of persons claiming exemption from combatant or noncombatant training because of conscientious objections, or as a member of the National Selective Service Appeal Board."

"(u) Section 10 of such Act is amended by (1) amending the sixth sentence of the proviso appearing in section 10 (b) (3) to read as follows: 'There shall be not less than one appeal board located within the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States and within each territory and possession of the United States, and such additional separate panels thereof, as may be prescribed by the President'; and (2) by adding at the end of section 10 a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Director of Selective Service shall submit to the Congress, on or before the 3d day of January of each year, a written report covering the operation of the Selective Service System and such report shall include, by States, information as to the number of persons registered under this Act; the number of persons inducted into the military service under this Act; and the number of deferments granted under this Act and the basis for such deferments."

"(v) Section 16 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out the word 'and' and inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following words: 'and Guam'."

"(w) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 17. (a) Except as provided in this title all laws or any parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict."

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission and all funds appropriated to pay the ex-

penses of training carried out by the military departments designated by the Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Department of Defense."

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no person shall be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces after July 1, 1955, except persons now or hereafter deferred under section 6 of this title after the basis for such deferment ceases to exist."

"(x) Section 21 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'July 9, 1951,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953,' (2) by striking out 'twenty-one' and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty-four,' and (3) by adding the following at the end thereof: 'Unless he is sooner released under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned, any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces between the period December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive, who is now or may hereafter be ordered to active duty pursuant to this section, shall upon completion of 17 or more months of active duty since June 25, 1950, if he makes application therefor to the Secretary of the branch of service in which he is serving, be released from active duty and shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 30 days without his consent except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not apply to any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve ordered to active duty whose rating or specialty is found by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be critical and whose release to inactive duty prior to the period for which he was ordered to active duty would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned.'

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of July 27, 1950 (64 Stat. 379), is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953' and by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: 'No person whose enlistment has been extended heretofore or hereafter for twelve months pursuant to this Act shall have his enlistment extended for any additional period of time under this Act.'

"(b) Section 7 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828), is amended by striking out 'July 9, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1953'."

"Sec. 3. The Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 408), is amended to read as follows:

"That provisions of law imposing restrictions on the authorized personnel strength of any component of the Armed Forces, including sections 102, 202, 213, and 302 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 357, 363, 369, and 371), section 2, title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 605), as amended, section 2 of the Act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), and sections 102 and 202 of the Act of July 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 322 and 323), are hereby suspended until July 31, 1954."

"Sec. 2. The active-duty personnel strength of the Armed Forces, exclusive of personnel of the Coast Guard, personnel of the reserve components on active duty for training purposes only, and personnel of the Armed Forces employed in the Selective Service System, shall not exceed a total of five million persons at any time during the period of suspension prescribed in the first section of this Act."

"Sec. 4. Wherever in this amendatory Act the period of active service for an category of persons is increased, such increased period of service shall be applicable to all persons in such category serving on active duty in the Armed Forces on the date of the enactment of this amendatory Act."

"Sec. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

"Sec. 6. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations as he may deem to be appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association who knowingly violates the regulations which may be made hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than twelve months, or both."

"Sec. 7. This title may be cited as the '1951 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act.'"

"TITLE II

"Sec. 21. The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army,' approved June 30, 1950 (Public Law 597, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by (1) striking out the words 'until June 30, 1953' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'until June 30, 1955', and (2) striking out the words 'two thousand five hundred' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'twelve thousand five hundred'."

And the House agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
By R. B. R.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

DRAFTING OF MEN FOR SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

1. *Termination of authority to draft men into the Armed Forces*

The authority to induct men into the Armed Forces has been extended for 4 years, to terminate on July 1, 1955.

The House amendment extended the authority to induct men into the Armed Forces until July 1, 1954. The Senate bill contained no termination date on this authority.

2. *Period of service*

The period of service for persons inducted into the Armed Forces will be 24 months, an increase of 3 months over the present period of service.

The House amendment provided for a period of service of 26 months; the Senate

bill provided for a period of service of 24 months. The House managers accepted the Senate version.

3. Registration

All male citizens of the United States and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States between the ages of 18 and 26 are required to register. Classification for induction purposes will take place as soon as practicable following registration. Technical changes were required in connection with the registration section to make it coincide with the new provisions applicable to aliens. The Senate managers accepted the House language with respect to classifying male registrants for induction purposes as soon as practicable following registration.

4. Draft age

The draft age has been reduced from 19 years to 18 years and 6 months for all male citizens of the United States and all other male persons admitted to the United States for permanent residence. All other persons who remain in the United States in a status other than that of permanent residents for a period exceeding 1 year, except those exempt from registration, shall be liable for training and service. Persons admitted to the United States other than as permanent residents who remain in the United States for more than 1 year may request release from training and service, but such a request will debar them from citizenship.

No person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces below the age of 19 by any local board so long as there are available within that local board eligible males between the ages of 19 through 25.

The Senate bill would have permitted the induction of men at the age of 18 provided there were not available within local boards men between the ages of 19 through 25. The Senate managers accepted the age for induction into the Armed Forces contained in the House amendment.

5. Reduction of physical and mental standards

The physical standards for induction will be those that prevailed in January of 1945; the mental standards will be established on the basis of a percentile score of 10 which corresponds to the previously used General Classification Test of 65. The new mental standards are a reduction of 3 from the present percentile score of 13 and corresponds to a reduction of 5 points from the previous standard of 70 heretofore established by law as a minimum General Classification Test score for induction.

The House amendment reduced the physical and mental standards to those that prevailed in January of 1945, which would have resulted in a General Classification Test score of approximately 40. The Senate bill contained no similar language. The agreement reached by the conferees should result in the reclassification for induction purposes of approximately 150,000 men who have heretofore been, or would shortly be, classified as IV-F.

6. Ceiling on the Armed Forces

Until July 31, 1954, the active duty strength of the Armed Forces shall not exceed more than 5,000,000 persons at any one time.

The House bill contained no limitation on the size of the Armed Forces. The Senate bill contained a 4,000,000-man ceiling.

7. Total obligated service

All persons entering the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps after the proposed legislation is enacted will be required to serve a total obligated period of service of 8 years. This requirement applies to all persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces, or inducted into the National Security Training Corps. The total period of obligated service includes

active duty, training duty in the National Security Training Corps, and active or inactive service in the reserve components.

The House amendment provided for a total obligated period of 6 years retroactive to persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed since June 25, 1950.

The Senate bill required a total obligated service of 8 years for all persons appointed, enlisted, or inducted after the proposed legislation was enacted. The House accepted the Senate provision.

8. Active duty for reservists

All reservists and retired personnel now or hereafter ordered to active duty may be required to serve 24 months. The authority of the President to order reservists and retired personnel to active duty is extended until July 1, 1953.

The House amendment limited the period of service to 21 months. The Senate bill contained the language set forth in the conference report. The House managers accepted the Senate provision.

9. Release of reservists

Unless sooner released under regulations prescribed by the respective Secretaries, any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served for a period of 12 months or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, shall, upon application, be released to inactive duty after he has completed 17 months of active duty including the time spent on active duty since June 25, 1950. Such persons shall not thereafter be ordered to active duty, without their consent, for a period in excess of 30 days, except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress. However, reservists found by the military departments concerned to possess a rating or specialty which is critical may be retained for the period for which they are ordered to active duty if their release prior to the completion of such period of time would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned.

This provision applies to officers and enlisted personnel.

The House amended provided for the release of veteran reservists ordered to active duty from the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve for those who served 90 days or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, or for those who had served 12 months or more between the period September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, after 12 months of active duty since June 25, 1950, upon application. The Senate bill contained no similar language. The language "unless sooner released" contained in the provision agreed to by the managers is to emphasize and assure that the 17-month period shall not be construed as a minimum period for which such reservists will be held. Present plans call for the release of many thousands of reservists prior to the completion of 17 months of service, and the language of the conference report is not intended to replace any plans for earlier releases.

10. Deferment of students

High school students will be deferred until they graduate from high school or attain the age of 20.

College students may be deferred until they complete their academic year but if they are deferred to complete an academic year they may not thereafter be deferred by statute to complete an academic year. No local board may be required to defer any college student based upon a Government-sponsored test score or upon the student's class standing.

This is identical with the House amendment.

11. Overseas assignment

Every person inducted into the Armed Forces shall be given a period of not less

than 4 months of training and may not be assigned for duty in any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, until after this 4-month period has elapsed. In addition, no other member of the Armed Forces who is enlisted, appointed, inducted, or ordered to active duty shall be assigned to duty at any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, until he has had the equivalent of 4 months of basic training.

The House amendment was confined only to persons inducted into the Armed Forces and required 4 months' training within the United States, its Territories, or possessions. In addition, the House amendment provided that no person inducted into the Armed Forces should be assigned for duty in a combat area on land located outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions, during the 6-month period immediately following his induction.

The Senate bill provided that inductees would be given 4 months' basic training and not be permanently assigned to duty outside the United States during this period, and further provided that no other member of the Armed Forces would be assigned to combat duty in a combat area until he had had at least 4 months of basic training.

The House and Senate managers agreed to the provision heretofore described which requires that all persons inducted into the Armed Forces be given 4 months' basic training and that no member of the Armed Forces shall be assigned to duty outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions until such persons have had the equivalent of 4 months' basic training.

12. Enlistment in the Regular Army

Men between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of 24 months and may not have their enlistments involuntarily extended except in time of war or national emergency. The Senate bill contained no comparable language and the Senate managers accepted the House language.

13. Extension of voluntary enlistments

The authority to involuntarily extend enlistments in the regular and reserve components of the Armed Forces is extended until July 1, 1953. Thus, all enlistments which expire after July 9, 1951, may be extended by the President for 12 months, but no person shall have his enlistment extended more than once. Existing law extends all such enlistments which expire between July 27, 1950, and July 9, 1951.

The House amendment extended this authority until July 1, 1952; the Senate bill until July 1, 1953. The House managers accepted the Senate language.

14. Aliens

All aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall be immediately liable for induction into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps under the same conditions applicable to citizens. Aliens admitted to the United States, other than as permanent residents, who remain in the United States for 1 year or more shall be liable for induction unless they request release from service. In the event that such persons request release from service, they will be debarred from citizenship.

With certain technical corrections, the provision in the conference report is that which was contained in the House amendment. There was no comparable language in the Senate bill and the Senate accepted the House language.

15. Conscientious objectors

Persons who are found by local boards to be opposed to noncombatant service shall be

ordered by their local boards, subject to regulations prescribed by the President, to perform civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest for a period of 24 months. A conscientious objector's refusal to perform such work will subject him to the penalties of the Selective Service Act.

The House amendment merely deferred such persons. The Senate bill required such persons to be assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction.

The House managers objected to this portion of the Senate bill since it contemplated the establishment of national work camps. The language agreed to by the House and Senate conferees will permit the President to prescribe the types of employment to which conscientious objectors may be assigned, but such employment will not be performed through the establishment of, or assignment to, national work camps.

16. Deferment of certain persons whose occupation is necessary for the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest

The President is authorized under such regulations and rules as he may prescribe to provide for the deferment from training and service or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

The House amendment gave the President the authority to defer persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, optometric, osteopathic, chiropractic, scientific, or other endeavors was found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

The Senate bill left unchanged the present law which authorizes such deferments for persons whose activity in study, research, or medical, scientific, or other endeavors was found to be necessary for the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The House and Senate managers agreed to the language above-described which includes those persons whose endeavors were named in the House amendment and, in addition, added veterinarians, pharmacists, and chiropodists.

17. Control over the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in, beer, wine, or any other intoxicating liquors

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to make such regulations as he deems appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in, alcoholic beverages to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near a camp, station, post, or other places primarily occupied by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps. Any person who knowingly violates such regulations may be punished by a fine of \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 12 months or punished under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The language agreed upon by the conferees is substantially the language contained in the House amendment. There was no comparable amendment in the Senate bill.

18. Continued liability for induction of persons now or hereafter deferred

Persons now or hereafter deferred from induction will remain liable for induction into the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps until they attain the age of 35. This language was contained in the House amendment and was accepted by the Senate managers.

There was no comparable language in the Senate bill.

19. Suspending or terminating inductions into the Armed Forces

The House amendment provided that the Congress by concurrent resolution could terminate or suspend all inductions into the Armed Forces. The Senate bill contained no comparable language.

The House managers receded from their insistence upon this provision and agreed to eliminate it from the conference report.

20. 75,000 students

The Senate bill provided for the selection from among persons who had completed their basic training of 75,000 students during the next 3 years. Such students were to have the remainder of their military obligation suspended until they completed the studies and research for which they were selected and there was authority in the Senate bill to provide for the payment of the cost of tuition, books, laboratory fees, subsistence, travel, and other necessary expenses of such persons to the extent they were unable to defray.

The House amendment contained no similar language.

The Senate agreed to recede from their insistence upon this provision and therefore the conference report contains no provision with respect to such students.

21. Enlistment of aliens

The Senate bill amended the act of June 30, 1950, in such a way as to permit the enlistment in the Regular Army of 25,000 aliens per year for a period of not less than 5 years.

The act of June 30, 1950, permitted the enlistment in the Regular Army until June 30, 1953, of not more than a total of 2,500 aliens.

The House amendment contained no similar language. The House and Senate managers agreed to the provision which permits the enlistment in the Regular Army, until June 30, 1955, of not more than a total of 12,500 aliens.

22. Women in the Armed Forces

Until July 31, 1954, the present 2 percent limitation of the number of women in the Armed Forces will be suspended.

The Senate amended the act of August 3, 1950, so as to suspend the present 2 percent limitation on the number of women that may be in the Armed Forces until July 31, 1954.

The House amendment contained no similar language. The House accepted the Senate amendment.

23. Authorized strength

The authorized strength for the Armed Forces is now suspended until July 31, 1954. The conference report, however, fixes the strength of the Armed Forces at 837,000 for the Army of the United States, 666,832 for the Navy, including the Marine Corps, and 502,000 for the Air Force of the United States. This is substantially a reenactment of existing law (sec. 2, Selective Service Act of 1948) except for the elimination from present law of all references to the number of authorized 1-year enlistees.

The Senate bill repealed outright the present law with respect to the limitation on the authorized strength of the Armed Forces now contained in the Selective Service Act.

The House amendment did not amend the present law with respect to authorized strength now contained in the Selective Service Act. The House and Senate managers agreed to continue the present statutory limitation on the size of the Armed Forces, suspended until July 31, 1954, but eliminated references to the authorized number of 1-year enlistees in view of the fact that the authority for such enlistments will be repealed by the conference report. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment repealed the authority for 1-year enlistments.

24. Reemployment rights

The House amendment, among other things, required persons discharged, following military service, to be restored to the same position held at the time of entering service. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The House agreed to accept the Senate language in view of the numerous difficulties involved in attempting to require employers to restore returning service personnel to the same position they held prior to entering the service. Existing law permits returning service personnel to be restored to the same position previously held or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

25. Communicating with Members of Congress

The House amendment provided that no member of the Armed Forces would be restricted from communicating with any Member of Congress. The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The Senate accepted the House language.

26. Authority to induct physicians and dentists

The House amendment provided that no physician or dentist engaged in full-time employment at a Veterans' Administration hospital would be inducted, under the provisions of law authorizing the induction of physicians and dentists, after such physician or dentist attained his thirtieth birthday.

The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The House receded from its position and agreed to the elimination of the provision from the conference report.

27. Appeal boards

The House amendment provided that there would not be less than one selective service appeal board located in the area of each Federal judicial district in the United States. The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The Senate accepted the House provision.

28. Reserve deferment appeal boards

The House amendment authorized the President to prescribe rules and regulations for the deferment of members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve, and authorized the President to establish civilian Reserve deferment appeal boards. Members of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve whose claim for deferment was denied would have been given the authority to have appealed their case to a civilian deferment appeal board.

The Senate bill contained no comparable language and the House managers agreed to recede from their insistence upon this provision.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

1. Establishment of Commission and National Security Training Corps

The conference report provides for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission to be composed of five members. Three members shall be civilians and two shall be active or retired members of the regular components of any of the Armed Forces. Of the three civilian members, not more than two shall be of the same political party.

The Chairman of the Commission must be a civilian. At such time as the Commission is appointed, a National Security Training Corps is established.

The Senate bill provided for the establishment of a five-man Commission to be composed of three civilians and two active or retired members of the regular components. The House amendment provided for a five-man commission to which not more than three could be of the same political party. Three members had to be civilians, one member an active or retired member of a regular component of the Armed Forces, and the remaining member of the

Commission a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided for the establishment of a National Security Training Corps at the time the Commission was appointed.

2. Compensation for Commission

The conference report provides for a term of years for members of the Commission and provides for a per diem of \$50 to be paid to members of the Commission while engaged in the business of the Commission.

This is similar to the House amendment.

There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill.

3. General authority of Commission

The conference report provides that the Commission, subject to the direction of the President, shall exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps and further provides that such training shall be basic military training. It authorizes the Commission to establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of members of the Corps as are necessary to carry out the objectives of the act. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to designate the military departments to carry out the training. The military departments so designated shall carry out the military training in accordance with the policies and standards established by the Commission. Subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, the military departments shall determine the type or types of military training to be given to the members of the National Security Training Corps.

The House amendment provided that the Commission should direct and control the policies of the National Security Training Corps and further provided that the Commission would issue "directives" to the military departments designated to carry out the military training.

The Senate bill provided that the Commission would, subject to the direction of the President, establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of initial basic training of members of the Corps as were necessary to carry out the objectives of the act, and, subject to the direction of the President, would designate the Federal departments and agencies to carry out such training. The departments and agencies so designated were to carry out the training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission.

In view of the fact that the House amendment did not contemplate that the Commission would act as an operating agency, the House managers agreed to the language contained in the conference report which grants to the Commission the authority to exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps.

The House amendment provided that, subject to the direction of the President and after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Commission would designate the military departments to carry out the training. Since basic military training, as such, is a military matter, the House managers agreed to the language contained in the conference report which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to designate the military departments to carry out the training.

4. Legislative recommendations

Not later than 4 months following the confirmation of members of the Commission, the Commission shall submit to the Congress legislative recommendations which shall include, but not be limited to, a broad outline deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to assure that the training car-

ried out under the provision of the proposed legislation will be of a military nature.

There is a specific provision in the conference report, however, stating that the Commission shall not have the authority to prescribe the basic type or types of training to be given members of the Corps. Thus the legislative recommendations will contain language which will grant the Commission authority to assure that the training carried out shall be of a military nature but the Commission will not submit legislative recommendations prescribing the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps.

In addition, the conference report provides that legislative recommendations with respect to a code of conduct, disability and death benefits, and other benefits and obligations and measures deemed necessary to implement any policies and standards established by the Commission shall be submitted by the Commission for legislative action.

As contained in the original House amendment the recommendations must be referred to both Committees on Armed Services and both committees, not later than the expiration of the first period of 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of Congress following the date on which the recommendations are submitted to the Congress, must report thereon to their respective Houses. As continued in the original House amendment, any bill or resolution so reported shall be privileged.

The House amendment provided for the Commission to submit its legislative recommendations not later than 6 months following its confirmation. The House amendment further provided that the legislative recommendations would include a program of initial military training deemed by the Commission to be appropriate to carry out the obligations of the act, including the types of basic military training to be given members of the National Security Training Corps and measures for utilizing existing schools and colleges to the fullest extent practicable. In view of the fact, as previously stated, that the original House amendment did not contemplate that the Commission would act as an operating agency, the House managers receded from their insistence that the Commission recommend to the Congress the types of basic military training to be given members of the Corps as well as a program of initial military training. The Senate bill contained no comparable language.

5. Induction into the National Security Training Corps

The conference report provides that no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until after (1) a code of conduct has been enacted and measures provided for disability and death benefits have been enacted into law, (2) that the other legislative recommendations submitted by the Commission have been considered and such recommendations or any portion thereof shall have been enacted with or without amendments into law, and (3) the period of service required of persons who have not attained the nineteenth anniversary of the day of their birth has been reduced or eliminated by the President or by the adoption of a concurrent resolution by the Congress.

Thus, the Congress will have an opportunity to consider and amend all of the recommendations submitted by the Commission, and no person can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until this has taken place.

The House amendment provided similar language as contained in the conference report but required that all legislative recommendations be enacted with or without

amendments into law. The House managers recognized the fact that the two most important features of a universal military training program involve a code of conduct and the death and disability benefits to be granted to the members of the Corps, along with provisions dealing with the health, safety, welfare, and morals of members of the National Security Training Corps. Thus, the House managers receded from their insistence upon the House amendment which required action on all legislative recommendations submitted, and agreed to the conference report which requires the enactment into law of a code of conduct and death and disability benefits and the consideration of all of the remaining recommendations submitted, followed by the enactment of any portion determined by the Congress to be desirable. It should be observed that the House amendment also provided that no person should be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until the period of service of persons under the age of 19 had been eliminated. To permit a more orderly initiation of universal military training and the gradual elimination of induction into the Armed Forces, the conference report permits induction into the National Security Training Corps, following the enactment of a code of conduct, death and disability benefits, and the consideration of the remaining recommendations and the enactment of any portion thereof, at such time as the period of service for persons under the age of 19 has been reduced or eliminated.

There was no comparable provision in the Senate bill.

6. Pay of members of the National Security Training Corps

Both the House and Senate bills provided that members of the National Security Training Corps would be paid \$30 per month but that their dependents would be entitled to the benefits of the Dependents Assistance Act. This provision is contained in the conference report.

7. Period of service

The conference report provides that persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps shall be trained for a period of 6 months. This was contained in the House amendment. The Senate bill provided that persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps would be trained for a period of not less than 4 months. The Senate conferees accepted the House language.

8. Age of induction

At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized, all persons thereafter registered who have not been inducted into the Armed Forces and who have not attained their nineteenth birthday shall be liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps. Since men are required to register at the age of 18, this will permit the induction of men into the National Security Training Corps after they have attained their eighteenth birthday. There will probably be an average period of approximately 3 months elapse between registration, classification, and induction.

The House amendment provided for induction into the National Security Training Corps at the age of 18 years and 6 months. The Senate bill provided for induction into the National Security Training Corps at the age of 18. The House accepted the Senate language in this respect.

9. Initiating induction into the National Security Training Corps

Induction into the National Security Training Corps may take place after (1) a code of conduct has been enacted, (2) death and disability benefits for members of the

Corps have been enacted, (3) the other legislative recommendations submitted by the Commission have been considered and any portion thereof have been enacted into law, and (4) at such time as the President or the Congress by the adoption of a concurrent resolution has reduced or eliminated the period of service required of persons who have not attained the anniversary of their nineteenth birthday.

Persons who are deferred for any of the reasons provided in the proposed legislation shall not be exempt from their liability for induction into the National Security Training Corps merely because they have passed their nineteenth birthday.

This is comparable to the House amendment except for the addition of the words "or reduced" which, as previously indicated, permits an orderly phasing of universal military training and the reduction or elimination of induction into the Armed Forces for men below the age of 19.

10. Overseas assignment of members of the National Security Training Corps

No person inducted into the National Security Training Corps may be assigned for training at any installation outside the continental United States except that residents of the Territories and possessions of the United States may be trained in the Territory or possession from which they were inducted.

11. Terminating inductions into the National Security Training Corps by concurrent resolution

The House amendment provided that induction into the National Security Training Corps could be terminated by the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution to this effect.

The Senate bill contained no comparable provision.

Since the duration of universal military training will properly be a question for consideration when the Commission submits its recommendations to the Congress, the House managers receded from their insistence on this provision, and it is thus not contained in the conference report.

MISCELLANEOUS

There are other technical changes contained in the conference report which do not affect the substance of the proposed legislation.

Two other minor changes involve the deferment of missionaries who are also physicians and adding Guam to the definition of the words "United States".

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
W. STERLING COLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, if the membership followed the Clerk as he read the statement of the managers on the part of the House, you no doubt gathered a full knowledge of what was accomplished in the conference which was held between the House and the other body. No bill in recent years has been considered as carefully as this bill. For 3 months the House Committee on Armed Services conducted extensive hearings on the matter. For 2 weeks it was debated here in the House. For 6 weeks it was considered by the House conferees. In my opinion, the conference report represents a better bill than that originally passed by the House, and,

of course, a better bill than that originally passed by the Senate. By the free exchange of views which prevailed throughout the conference, I believe we have prepared legislation to which no one can find any serious objection.

I can state, with a certain amount of pride, that, generally speaking, the House position prevailed in most of the major issues at stake, particularly with respect to the draft age and universal service. There were approximately 25 major areas of disagreement, all of which have been settled satisfactorily. The most significant is the agreement with respect to the requirement that Congress must take another look at universal military training before it can be put into operation. I stated to the House originally that I felt that Congress should have another opportunity to examine this feature in greater detail and I am happy to say that the conference report requires such a procedure.

Before I explain the conference report in greater detail, I would like to express, publicly and for the record, my appreciation for the outstanding statesmanship displayed during the conferences held on this bill by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT's opposition to universal military training at this time is well known.

But, setting aside his personal convictions, and acting as a conferee of the House, he carried out the wishes of a majority of the House as expressed in the House bill that was sent to conference.

At no time did he let his personal convictions sway him from supporting the views of the House, and his contribution to the tremendous task of reconciling the two bills helped greatly in the preparation of what I consider to be an outstanding report.

He deserves the thanks of the entire membership, for he was placed in a difficult position. It was not an easy task to set aside sincere and honestly held views toward a vital subject, and act as an agent of the House in a matter that passed the House against his views.

I want to also express my personal gratitude to the other House managers, for their faithful attendance, their patience, and their very important contributions to the report.

Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. ARENDS, are entitled to the thanks of the House for a highly important job well done.

Now I hope that all of the Members will give me their attention while I explain the report in detail, for this is the most important measure that will be considered during this session of the Congress.

I can say with sincerity that I believe it warrants the unanimous support of the House membership.

The universal military training and service bill agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees contains the following salient features:

DRAFT FOR SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES

First. Termination of Draft Act: The authority to induct into the Armed

Forces has been extended for 4 years and will terminate on July 1, 1955. When the bill passed the House we extended it 3 years. The Senate had no time limit on it. We took the position—and we think rightly so—that in all emergency legislation there should be a termination date. That had been the philosophy of the Committee on Armed Services where we enact emergency legislation.

Second. Period of service: The period of service for persons inducted in the Armed Forces is 24 months. When we passed the bill in the House it was 26 months. The Senate had 24 months, and we agreed to 24 months. Thus, draftees can only be held in the service for 24 months.

Third. Registration: This law applies to all male citizens of the United States and every other male person now or hereafter in the United States between the ages of 18 and 26. Thus the age for registration applies to all males between the ages of 18 and 26. Classification for induction purposes will take place as soon as practicable following registration.

Fourth. Draft age: The age fixed for induction into the Armed Forces is from 18½ to 26, but no one can be drafted into the Armed Forces by any local board if there is available within that local board any person between the age of 19 through 26.

Fifth. Reduction of physical and mental standards: The physical standards for induction will be those that prevailed in January of 1945; the mental standards will be established on the basis of a percentile score of 10 which corresponds to a General Classification Test score of 65. The new mental standards, therefore, are a reduction of 3 from the present percentile score minimum of 13 and a reduction of 5 from the previous standard of 70 heretofore established by law as a minimum General Classification Test score for induction. The reduction should result in reclassification or making available for induction approximately 150,000 men who have heretofore or would shortly be classified as IV-F.

Sixth. Ceiling on the Armed Forces: When the House passed the bill there was no ceiling as to the strength of the armed services. An effort was made in the committee on several occasions to write in a ceiling, and we had one or two teller votes on the question, but no ceiling was put on. However, the Senate wrote a ceiling of 4,000,000 men. So we compromised by putting the ceiling at 5,000,000 men.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question relative to the provision in the House bill concerning the utilization of the schools and colleges of the country.

Mr. VINSON. I will explain that, if I may, a little later. That was Mr. ROGERS' amendment about schools. When I discuss UMT I will explain that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he goes to that?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. In connection with the deferment of students the report says that college students may be deferred until they complete their academic year, but they may get only one deferment.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly what the House bill said when it passed the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to have the gentleman state what is meant by that phrase "as far as further deferments is concerned."

Mr. VINSON. It means if he is deferred once, he cannot again obtain a statutory deferment. That is all it means.

Mr. HINSHAW. But it does not mean that he cannot go on with his studies if the draft board allows him to?

Mr. VINSON. No; if he falls under any deferment that the President may provide by regulation, he can, of course, qualify for further deferment.

Seventh. Total obligated service: Men will be required to serve a total obligated period of service of 8 years. This applies to all persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or inducted into the National Security Training Corps. The total period of obligated service includes active duty, training duty in the National Security Training Corps, and active or inactive service in the Reserve components.

Eighth. Active duty for reservists: Reservists now or hereafter ordered to active duty may be required to serve 24 months. The authority of the President to order all reservists to active duty is extended until July 1, 1953.

Ninth. Release of reservists: Any reservist, officer, or enlisted man ordered to active duty from the Volunteer or Inactive Reserve shall be released to inactive duty upon application after 17 months of active duty if he served for 1 year or more on active duty during World War II.

All time spent on active duty since June 25, 1950, counts.

However, the Secretaries of the military departments are authorized to retain reservists on active duty for the period for which they were ordered to active duty if they possess a rating or specialty found to be critical, and if their release would impair efficiency.

This provision is not to be construed as a minimum period of active duty for veteran reservists ordered to active duty from the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve. The military departments plan to release many thousands of reservists prior to the completion of 17 months of active duty.

Tenth. Deferment of students: High-school students will be deferred until they graduate from high school or attain the age of 20. College students may be deferred until they complete their academic year, but if they are deferred to complete an academic year, they may not thereafter be deferred again to complete an academic year. No local board may be required to defer any college student based upon a Government-sponsored national test score or upon the student's class standing.

Eleventh. Overseas assignment: Every person inducted into the Armed Forces

shall be given a period of not less than 4 months of training and may not be assigned for duty in any installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories or possessions, until after this 4-month period has elapsed. In addition, no member of the Armed Forces who is enlisted, appointed, or ordered to active duty shall be assigned to duty at an installation located on land outside the United States, its Territories or possessions, until he has had the equivalent of at least 4 months of basic training.

Twelfth. Enlistment in the Regular Army: Men between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 26 years shall be offered an opportunity to enlist in the Regular Army for a period of 24 months and may not have their enlistment involuntarily extended except in time of war or national emergency.

Thirteenth. Extension of voluntary enlistments: The authority to involuntarily extend enlistments in the Regular and Reserve components of the Armed Forces is extended until July 1, 1953. That is, all enlistments which expire after July 9, 1951, may be extended by the President for 12 months, but no person shall have his enlistment extended more than once.

Fourteenth. Aliens: All aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States shall be immediately liable for induction into the Armed Forces of the National Security Training Corps of the United States. Aliens admitted to the United States other than as permanent residents who remain in the United States for 1 year or more shall be liable for induction unless they request release from service, in which case they will forever be debarred from citizenship.

Fifteenth. Conscientious objectors: Subject to regulations issued by the President, persons who are found by local boards to be opposed to noncombatant service shall be ordered by their local boards to perform civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest, for a period of 24 months.

A conscientious objector's refusal to perform such work will subject him to the penalties of the Selective Service Act.

Sixteenth. Alcoholic beverages: The Secretary of Defense is given the authority to issue regulations controlling the use of alcoholic beverages at or near military camps. Persons who knowingly violate such regulations will be subject to fine and imprisonment.

Now, I would like to turn to the provisions concerning universal military training. When we had up the question of universal military training during the House debate, the House was of the opinion, I am sure, that Congress should know all about what the plan should be. Thus, we established a commission and we established a training corps, but we wrote a provision in the House bill which stated that no person could be inducted until certain things took place. We felt that Congress should know all about the plan; and we have brought back a report that carries out the wishes of the House in that respect.

I may say that is one reason it was held up for six long weeks. If it had not been for agreement on that, instead

of having this conference report here today there would probably be a resolution to extend the draft law.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, it goes a little further than that. It is not simply that Congress has to know all about it, but the Congress has to approve the program?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. It has to enact legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the Commission reports a plan to the Armed Services Committee, and the Armed Services Committee in turn submits that plan as a bill to the Congress within the 45-day limit provision in the section, and the House or the Senate or both reject the plan or defeat the bill, then what is the situation?

Mr. VINSON. No man can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then what does the Commission do? Does it submit a new plan?

Mr. VINSON. The Commission, I would say, would try to work up something that is in accordance with the views of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And it would continue in operation even though Congress disapproved its recommendation?

Mr. VINSON. It would, and for that reason we did not put them on a salary; we put them on a per diem basis.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. With the thought that they would not work if they did not get paid.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly. We have a good bill, Mr. Speaker.

I must now continue with the UMT phase of this report. The recommendation of the Commission comes back; your Armed Services Committee will consider it just like it does other proposed legislation; it will be open to amendment on the floor of the House and it must be passed by a majority of a quorum; it must be signed by the President of the United States and become a law before any man can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps.

Mr. BARDEN. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am very much in favor of that as he heard me attempt to express myself for about an hour on one occasion. With reference to this matter of the utilization of educational institutions, when the Commission brings in its report as outlined under section 7 it is distinctly and clearly understood that an amendment or a proposal for the utilization of schools and colleges and the educational facilities of this country would be germane and would be considered?

Mr. VINSON. I may say that if they submit a plan any Member of the House, under the general rules of germaneness, would have the right to offer any amendment. Here is what we decided on that point:

The amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] would have directed the Commission to submit recommendations to the Congress for the utilization of the schools and colleges of the Nation in the

universal military training program. Both the Senate conferees and the House conferees, after considerable discussion, agreed that this matter could be handled by the Congress when the plan was submitted. Its elimination from the Commission's report would not in any way preclude the consideration of such school utilization if the Congress deems it advisable when the program is being considered by the Congress.

Mr. BARDEN. Here is what I want to appear in the RECORD, that the chairman believes that that should be done, that the House should have an opportunity to consider it.

Mr. VINSON. When they submit it, if it is not in, I will raise that point for consideration myself. That is as far as I can go; I cannot guarantee that it will be passed, but it will be considered by the committee, and I am satisfied it can be considered by the House.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. I should like to get the chairman's view with respect to one thing for the RECORD; that is, conscientious objectors.

Mr. VINSON. In the Senate bill they established work camps.

Mr. SUTTON. I am not referring to that; but in the extension of the draft it means that the conscientious objectors are subject to the local draft board; is that right?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. In the Senate bill, as I say, they created work camps; in our report we have worked out a method whereby a conscientious objector can be deferred by the local draft board provided he is engaged in some occupation that contributes to the welfare or the defense of the country.

Mr. SUTTON. That is subject to Presidential regulation; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct; it is subject to Presidential regulation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Georgia explain why the period of training for inactive and volunteer reserves was increased by 5 months over the House provision?

Mr. VINSON. The inactive reserves?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; the inactive and volunteer reserves. The period of active service was increased by 5 months to a total of 17 months.

Mr. VINSON. The Senate bill had no release provision with respect to veteran inactive and volunteer reservists. The House amendment required their release after 12 months. The Senate conferees objected to this provision, and felt that it should be part of the Reserve legislation soon to be considered. We finally agreed to the provision which requires their release after 17 months, but it is not to be considered a minimum. Under the system they are going to adopt, I doubt whether many of them will be held more than 17 months.

Let me briefly run through the high lights of the universal-military-training features:

First. The conference report establishes a National Security Training Commission composed of five members.

Three members must be civilians.

Two members must be active or retired member of the Regular components of the Armed Forces.

Not more than two of the three civilian members may be from the same political party.

The members must be confirmed by the Senate.

The Chairman must be a civilian.

The Commission to be appointed for a term of years.

Civilian members and retired members of Armed Forces to receive \$50 per day while engaged in work of the Commission.

Second. At such time as the Commission is appointed, a National Security Training Corps is established.

Third. Duties of the Commission:

The Commission, subject to the direction of the President, is given the authority to exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps.

The training must be basic military training.

The Commission is authorized to establish policies and standards with respect to the conduct and training of members of the National Security Training Corps.

The Commission must make adequate provisions for the moral and spiritual welfare of the members of the Corps.

The Secretary of Defense will designate the military departments to conduct the training.

The military departments must carry out the training in accordance with the policies and standards established by the Commission.

The military departments, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and the policies and standards of the Commission, will determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the corps.

Fourth. Legislative recommendations: Within 4 months after confirmation of the Commission, the Commission must submit to the Congress legislative proposals which shall include, but not be limited to (a) an outline of a program deemed by the Commission and approved by the Secretary of Defense to be appropriate to make sure that the training will be of a military nature with the understanding that the Commission will not have the authority to authorize the basic type or types of training to be given to the members of the corps; (b) recommendations with respect to the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of members of the corps; (c) a code of conduct; (d) recommendations with respect to the death and disability benefits and other benefits and obligations of members of the corps; (e) measures necessary to implement the policies and standards to be established by the Commission.

Fifth. Recommendations must go to the Committees on Armed Services: (a) within 45 calendar days of continuous sessions of Congress the Committees on Armed Services must report a bill or res-

olution to their respective Houses on the recommendations; (b) such bill or resolution will be privileged.

Sixth. No inductions to take place without further legislation: No person can be inducted for universal military training until after Congress has enacted: (a) a code of conduct and measures providing disability and death benefits for members of the corps; and the Congress (b) has considered and enacted into law all or a portion of the recommendations submitted by the Commission; (c) even after such laws have been enacted, no person can be inducted until either the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, reduces or eliminates the period of service in the Armed Forces for persons below the age of 19.

Seventh. Age for induction into the National Security Training Corps: At such time as induction into the National Security Training Corps is authorized all persons then or thereafter registered at the age of 18 will be liable for induction into the National Security Training Corps. In other words men will be inducted into the National Security Training Corps after arriving at the age of 18. There will still be a period of time involved in classifying such registrants, however, so that generally speaking, it can be said that induction into the National Security Training Corps will take place for most of the young men eligible for that training at the age of 18 years and 3 months. Men who are deferred from induction into the National Security Training Corps may not escape liability for induction therein merely by remaining deferred until they pass their nineteenth birthday.

Eighth. Report required of the Commission: The Commission must submit comprehensive reports on the operation of the universal military training program and the Secretary of Defense must do likewise.

Ninth. Pay, period of service, and no overseas assignments fixed by statute: Members of the training corps will receive \$30 per month but will be entitled to the benefits of the Dependents Assistance Act if they have dependents. Members will be trained for 6 months. No person can be assigned for training at any installation located on land outside the continental United States—except residents of the Territories and possessions may be trained in the area from which they were inducted.

Tenth. Termination date for universal military training: The conference report does not contain any termination date for universal military training since this matter will be subject to congressional action when the required implementing legislation is considered by the Congress.

I sincerely trust the report will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I can truthfully say never have I sat in a conference where legislation was more carefully and thoroughly considered as that which is now before us. I must pause just long enough to pay my re-

spects and high admiration to the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, who acted as chairman of the conference, for his eminent fairness at all times, for his courtesy, his kindness, and consideration. Certainly, he does not excel the champion from Georgia, our own distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House [Mr. VINSON] who stood as firm as the Rock of Gibraltar, and in all the bitter wrangling that we had since April 17 I found out that whenever the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, makes a promise to a person, he keeps it, and he certainly kept his promise to the Members of this House. As you know, he accepted an amendment which would require, before UMT went into effect, Congress to take positive, affirmative action, and if he had not changed the original bill on this floor by accepting that amendment, it never would have passed this House. He promised us at the time the bill was passed that he would insist upon that chief primary provision in the legislation. He did, and the Senate—though some Senators were pretty stubborn for several days—finally yielded and accepted the House position.

I do not have to remind Members that always I have opposed peacetime military conscription. I know, too, that a great man once said, "to act contrary to conscience is neither safe nor upright." I signed this conference report, but I do not want anyone to think that I have surrendered or capitulated. I signed it because I was acting in an official capacity as a manager on the part of this House to maintain the House position. I think the House of Representatives is bigger than any individual or any party or any faction in it. Though I spoke against and voted against the bill when it passed the House, I felt duty bound and obligated to go along with the House conferees in maintaining the position of the House, and for that reason I signed the conference report. Because in the main the House provisions prevailed.

I am not going to press the matter or fuss much about it. Personally I do not care for a roll call; I do not think the chairman of our committee cares for it, though I am informed the distinguished majority leader will ask for a roll call on this conference report, and if we do have a roll call, of course, I would be compelled to vote against it, because I would be voting as an individual, my own personal convictions, in this matter.

From the start I felt that it was a grave mistake to mix UMT with the draft law. The only reason they were put together is because the proponents of this legislation realized, I think, that it is now or never, and taking advantage of the pressure from all sides and the emotionalism and hysteria of the hour they tied the two in together, mixing castor oil with the orange juice, sugar-coating the pill. Of course the draft at this time must be extended. There is no argument about this. I thought when we first considered the legislation that it would have been much better for us to simply extend the draft for the time being and then after the crises subsided

we could bring in a new, clean UMT bill and consider it on its own merits. I am happy to say that General MacArthur, since we considered this legislation, in his testimony before the Senate committee, agreed to this position. He thinks it would have been wise for us to have separated the issues. But, it has already been done, and you have no alternative in the matter and you are going to be called upon to vote on this conference report.

I am not going to quarrel with any man as to how he shall vote. You know, there is wisdom in multitude of counsel. You may be right and I may be wrong about this legislation. I think the chairman of our committee, and certainly most of our professional staff members, will tell you that I have wrestled with my conscience and judgment over this matter for several years, particularly in recent months, and they know that I will agree to have some type of military-training bill that would be acceptable, not only to me, but to many people who feel as I do about it. Certainly, I do not want this country Prussianized, and I do not think in the present conference report there is any grave danger of our falling completely under military control as long as three of the members of this Commission are to be civilians and the Chairman is to be a civilian, always under civilian control, though the actual operational part of the program must and should be and will be under the military. Unless the training is military, there is no justification for it at all.

There are two things in the conference report that I regret. One is the period of service which was extended from the present law of 21 to 24 months. The Senate bill provided for 24 months and the House bill 26 months. We yielded to the Senate, which I think was really a victory for us, so we cannot quarrel over that.

The period of obligated service for reservists is not 6 years but 8 years, a pretty long time, yet considering world conditions and the uncertainty not only of today but of the future, perhaps for several years to come, 8 years is perhaps not too much. Who knows? I don't.

The most objectionable feature in the bill is the treatment we give to the reservists, the release of reservists. The Senate had no provision in their bill at all about this. We had a provision in our bill that after 12 months of service these boys who have been dragged in, most of them in their late twenties and early thirties, with 2 or 3 years of combat in World War II, with two or three children, who have bought a farm or built a house or gone into business and had their education seriously interrupted already, these fellows will not be released after 12 months as provided in the House bill but after 17 months.

Of course, we have to bear in mind that it usually takes a month to get a man from this country to the combat battle line, and it usually takes a month after he stops fighting to get him back home. So from the purely financial point of view this is a good provision, but it is pretty rough and

tough on these reservists who had fought so valiantly in World War II.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he is making. In connection with the 17 months' service of an inactive reservist, I note on page 18 of the conference report that there is an out for the military, so that they can continue these men in service for the full 24 months, if their release prior to the completion of such time would impair the efficiency of the military department concerned.

Mr. SHORT. That is true, and of necessity it must be that way, because you cannot yank men out of combat in Korea or any other section of the world unless you have replacements for them. It is a hardship, but war is hard. I think a great general once called it hell.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I appreciate the gentleman's answer to my question, but I assume that the conferees in interpreting this language will insist that the military use it strictly in accordance with the language laid down by the committee, that they are not going to abuse it, and will limit it to such ratings as radar specialists and people that they cannot get otherwise.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy the gentleman from Washington made that statement, because I share his apprehension, as do other members not only of our committee but of this House. We are going to see to it that we always keep the military under civilian control in this country.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Think of the inactive first lieutenant who is leading a platoon out in Korea, having led one in World War II. They cannot say they cannot get other lieutenants to lead infantry troops. I do not want that kind of interpretation placed on it.

Mr. SHORT. No, I do not think any such interpretation would be given. Certainly we hope not. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentleman ought to correct his statement to show that the inactive and the volunteer reserve who has been called against his wishes is the one who will have to serve 17 months.

Mr. SHORT. Yes, that is absolutely right. I did not know I had said anything differently. They can be released after 17 months, including time on active duty since June 25, 1950, if they had served 12 months during the shooting war, December 7, 1941, to September 2, 1945.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain loopholes in this bill which I do not like but lack of time prevents my discussing them. I do hope we shall never accept the Prussian idea of a single Chief of Staff.

After all, this bill is more or less innocuous. It does not establish universal military training but merely sets up a

commission which shall report not later than 4 months after the enactment of the legislation, a plan which will be considered by the Armed Services Committees of both Houses, as well as the entire Congress itself. No induction into the UMT Corps can take place until Congress first enacts a code of conduct, death, and disability benefits. The Congress must take positive and affirmative action and the ultimate outcome of this legislation will depend on the kind of program which is submitted to us. If it is a good and workable program that will not bankrupt the Nation, I predict that the Congress will pass it almost unanimously.

For the benefit of all Members I wish to call attention to the excellent analysis made and inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, June 6, page A3334 by our distinguished and able colleague from Michigan, the Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Is the gentleman willing to state unequivocally that acceptance of this conference report does not make it mandatory upon Congress to adopt some type of a universal military training program if and when the proposed commission reports a program?

Mr. ARENDS. That is right; in my opinion, it is absolutely right.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the so-called draft-UMT bill now before us is the end result in the long legislative process by which practically every phase of the Nation's manpower problem and every feature of this proposed legislation has been thoroughly considered. I do not know that any measure has been more exhaustively discussed than this one. The report now before us is the end product hammered out on the anvil of legislative debate over a period of several months.

The bill originally reported by our Committee on Armed Services, as a substitute to the Senate bill, was itself the result of extensive hearings and thorough examination. It was then earnestly and somewhat vigorously debated here on the floor under a liberal rule allowing 3 days of general debate and any amendment the House in its wisdom saw fit to adopt.

When the bill was sent to conference there were approximately 20 points of difference between the House and Senate bills. Some were minor and others were of vital importance. The pending report is the result of many meetings of the conferees and long hours of discussion. Every single point of disagreement was considered. This report is necessarily the product of compromise. It could not be otherwise.

While I cannot say that I personally approve every single provision of the bill, I am sure I can say that this report represents the collective judgment of the Congress. As one of the conferees I think I can also say with some pardon-

able pride, that the report embodies in large measure the basic wishes of the House. I accordingly signed the report. I hope that it will have the complete endorsement of the House.

You may recall that when this bill was originally before the House I was actively interested in having certain basic provisions adopted. One was that there be a fixed termination date both for the draft feature and the UMT feature of the pending bill. Another was that there be a definite ceiling as to the size of our armed services. A third was that there be a prohibition against sending troops to Europe to implement the Atlantic Pact without specific authorization from Congress. And still a fourth was that the proposed UMT program be considered separate and apart from the draft program.

The bill as passed by the House embodied my views in these respects to only a limited extent. While not satisfactory to me in every respect I nonetheless voted for the bill when it passed the House by the overwhelming majority of 372 to 44.

As one of the conferees I earnestly sought, as did the other House conferees, to sustain the views of the House in every possible particular. We necessarily had to yield and compromise on certain points. Thanks to the able leadership of our distinguished chairman, I believe we enjoyed a large measure of success in having the views of the House as a whole adopted in their basic aspects.

Throughout the consideration of this bill one of the major points of issue, both in committee and on the floor, was with respect to the proposed UMT program. This was one of the major questions in conference. A great many of us believed that regardless of the merits of UMT, it was a long-range program and should be considered entirely separate and apart from questions relating to the present military manpower needs provided by the draft law.

When the bill was before the House we reached a more or less compromise result by agreeing to a provision to the effect that the so-called UMT program would not be put into effect until the Congress itself had had the opportunity to consider this matter in detail and to work its will on the subject. The House bill provided for the establishment of a National Security Training Commission which would report to Congress within 6 months its recommendations for the program. The conference report still embodies this important feature, except that the length of time within which the Commission must make its report is reduced from 6 months to 4 months.

There is also another important change, with which I do not believe strong exception can be made. The conferees agreed that the Commission's recommendations shall not relate to the types of basic military training to be given but rather shall pertain to the program in broad outline and to measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the National Security Training Corps, as well as to a code of conduct and penalties. In other words,

it was the decision of the conferees to leave the question of the basic type of military training to the military people themselves and general supervision and other matters to the Commission.

The point to be emphasized is that under the terms of the compromise on the UMT feature no person shall be inducted into the National Security Training Corps until the Congress itself has acted on the legislative recommendations to be submitted by the Commission. In other words, we have preserved in the pending report the views of the House that the Congress shall have opportunity to express its will on this UMT program. In my opinion, this was a distinct victory for the House conferees.

The bill that the Committees on Armed Services of the two Houses report on this subject shall be privileged but shall be subject to amendment any member may offer. In other words, we have preserved in principle the conviction of the House that regardless of the merits of a UMT program, the Congress should have the opportunity to work its will on this subject, independent and apart from our present military needs arising under the Selective Service Act.

Many of you will also be pleased to note that the report provides for a ceiling on the size of our armed services. The Senate bill contained a 4,000,000-man ceiling. The House bill contained no such limitation. The issue was compromised in conference by fixing the figure at 5,000,000 persons at any one time. While I personally feel the figure is too high, nonetheless the basic principle of Congress having full control over the size of our Armed Forces is maintained.

We reached another compromise to which I believe some special reference should be made because of the general interest in the reservists. Our House bill contained a provision which provided in substance that veteran reservists on active duty for 12 months after June 25, 1950, shall be released upon his own application. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The compromise reached in conference raises the length of active duty necessary for release to 17 months.

I know that many of us would prefer to have the period limited to the House provision of 12 months. That is my personal preference. However, I call your special attention to the fact that the 17-month period is not to be construed as the minimum period for which veteran reservists are to be held on duty. As a matter of fact, all the services have put into effect replacement programs for the release of veteran reservists who have been called to active duty. If these plans continue as originally contemplated there will be very few veteran reservists on duty at the end of this year who were called about a year ago. Moreover, we anticipate that at some subsequent date legislation will be reported dealing with the whole reservist program. As you may know, a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] has been studying this subject of Reserves in detail.

In this matter of the release of veteran reservists it should be borne in mind that the provision in the House bill and in this report applies solely to inactive veteran reservists as distinguished from the veteran reservists who belonged to various Organized Reserve units, the members of which were paid for attending meetings or drills and received point credit for such attendance for retirement.

In conclusion, permit me to state again that while this conference report may not be satisfactory in every particular to each and every one of us, I sincerely believe that it expresses in basic principles the wishes of the House. It should therefore have the endorsement of the House.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. On page 23 of the report, after subheading (3), the conference report says the Commission shall have general supervision, and indicates a wide authority. Then, on page 25, a few limitations are put on.

I am making this very short. I voted for this bill, as the gentleman knows; but it seems to me that we may have UMT, in accepting the conference report, whether we want it or not, and I do not want to find that the only provisions brought back to Congress have to do with disability and death benefits, and any other questions the Commission itself may decide to ask us. Will the gentleman please explain?

Mr. ARENDS. No. Only through affirmative action of the Congress. In other words, we can adopt or reject any proposal that the Commission sends up here, regardless of what the Armed Services Committee may determine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I favor the conference report with the exception of the provisions that affect those volunteer and inactive reserves who have been called to active duty against their own wishes. Most of them are veterans of World War II.

When this bill was considered by the House Armed Services Committee we members of that committee spent many hours discussing the treatment accorded the Reserves. After a lengthy discussion the committee unanimously agreed as did Mrs. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of National Defense that the Reserve program had been poorly administered by the Defense Department and that the reserve himself had been mistreated. My personal opinion is that the word "mistreated" was mild and that word that should be used was "tortured," for it more aptly describes the treatment accorded reserves by not only the Defense Department but also by the component branches of our Armed Forces.

After the House Armed Services Committee had spent hours discussing the

Reserve problem in general we wrote a proviso into the bill that any member of the inactive or volunteer reserve who served for a period of 12 months or more between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, shall upon application be released to inactive duty after he has completed 12 months of active duty. When I speak of an inactive or volunteer reserve I speak of one who did not attend drills, one who did not take his summer training and one who did not receive pay for being a member of the Reserve. This type of a reserve is one who was solicited by the various branches of the armed services and asked to join a Reserve unit with the understanding that he would only be called to active duty should his country become involved in a national emergency. At the time the reserve was solicited for membership there was nothing contained in any law that permitted the armed services to call him to active duty. Last year without warning the Congress of the United States amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 authorizing the call to active duty of any type of reserve. By so doing, Congress violated the contract that existed between the inactive and volunteer reserve and the Government of the United States.

With this authority the armed services launched a program of ruthlessly calling up the inactive and the volunteer reserve without considering the fact that the average reservist served anywhere from 2 to 5 years in World War II. The fact he had decorations including the Purple Heart was not given any consideration. There was no concern shown for the reservist or his family nor for his job or his efforts to complete his education. He was abruptly taken from civilian life and the hardships that resulted cannot be adequately described in words.

As the result of this inhuman treatment the reservist's mind is poisoned and his attitude so bitter that there is not a member of this Congress who has not received scores of letters containing violent protests over the shabby treatment accorded these veterans of World War II who made a stellar contribution in winning that conflict.

These reservists cannot understand why they have been conscripted and thrown into combat while thousands of organized reserves are still on inactive duty and Selective Service is monthly lowering the draft requirements. During the month of July draft quotas have been lowered to 15,000 and frankly there is no answer to the criticism voiced by inactive and volunteer reserves. They are the victims of maladministration and the resulting injustice that follows in its wake.

As I have said before the House version of the UMT bill provided for release of these inactive and volunteer reserves after 12 months of active duty. Now we find that this conference committee report extends the 12 months of active duty to 17 months. In the vernacular of the armed services the reservists have been given another shellacking when this bill becomes a law.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It does not make any difference how sweetly proponents of this report mouth the words "unless sooner released," the fact still remains that they have added five more months to the active service of Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Last fall the Department of the Army announced a point system, and distributed information throughout the services telling the men that after they had acquired a certain number of points they would be sent home. Then, within a matter of a week, the Department of the Army completely ignored the point system and the Reserves started asking the question, "Where is the point system?" The truth of the matter is that the Army had no intention of putting the point system in effect. It was nothing more than a sugar-coated promise designed to quiet the Reserves on the eve of last fall's general election.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not agree that someone in the Department of Defense has been dragging his feet concerning giving relief to the reservist?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Absolutely. Mrs. Rosenberg in her statement before the House Armed Services Committee stated the entire Reserve program has been mal-administered and the reservists poorly treated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman think in view of the fact that the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], which is now writing a Reserve program, that if there is any injustice done in this bill it can be dealt with and corrected by the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is on that subcommittee?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly, but that is another sugar-coated promise because it will take months before any Reserve program can be written into law.

Mr. VINSON. With the gentleman's aid I hope we shall have it in less than 30 days.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Already we have been waiting and waiting for 18 months. We started consideration of it last year and nothing has been done about it yet, even despite Mrs. Rosenberg's report to us that the Reserve program was mal-administered.

Mr. VINSON. I hope the gentleman is not trying to convey to the House that the viewpoint he is now expressing cannot be solved; we all recognize the force of the well-meaning criticism the gentleman is directing to this problem, and we are trying to correct it and will when we bring out a Reserve program bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. While it is our hope that a new Reserve program will be a reality in the near future we are

losing a golden opportunity in this bill to regain the confidence of the reservists and to restore their faith in Congress.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Under the conference report can the enlistment of Volunteer Reserves, Inactive Reserves, be extended 1 year beyond the termination date of their contract?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It can be extended to July 1 of 1953.

Mr. FORD. Can the gentleman give any logical explanation of the right to extend the 4-year term or 3-year term enlistment contract of a volunteer or inactive reservist?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I cannot. Being brutally frank, the contract that the reservist has with his Government has been ruthlessly ignored so many times in recent months that it appears to be but a scrap of paper. Let me say in conclusion that in my opinion the great majority of all Reserves now on active duty are so sour and bitter over the treatment accorded them that upon discharge they will never have anything to do with the Reserve components of our Military Establishments. They have had enough and I agree with them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the remarks just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] are a stern indictment of this provision of the conference report.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is completely qualified to speak on this subject of the treatment of reservists not only because he has been a reservist himself and served in two World Wars but because he is a member of the House Armed Services Committee and he has first-hand knowledge of the shameful treatment that has been accorded reservists, particularly inactive and volunteer Reserves, since the fighting started in Korea.

Now the House members of the conference committee come here this afternoon and blandly admit they yielded and added five additional months to the 12 that were stipulated in the bill approved by the House, making inactive and volunteer reservists subject to 17 months of active service.

To whom did they yield in conference? Was it to Senate members of the conference committee or was it to the brass hats in the Pentagon? Up to this point in the discussion there has been no adequate explanation and there probably will be none.

As a matter of fact, members of the House conference committee yielded time after time on provisions which were written into the bill in the House. The result is that this legislation is even less acceptable, if that is possible, than when it originally passed the House.

The conference report emphasizes language now used in the bill which provides that inactive and volunteer veteran reservists will serve 17 months "unless sooner released."

That "unless sooner released" language amounts to an all-day sucker and nothing more. It sounds nice but it will not fool veteran reservists. If the

House conferees believed as Members of the House did when they passed this provision that 12 months was an adequate period of service for veteran reservists then why did they join in passing out this all-day sucker?

This is only one of several rotten provisions in this bill as it now stands, and it is lamentable that the parliamentary situation is such that a recommittal motion is not in order. We have no alternative but to vote to accept or reject this conference report and the law which it will establish.

I will certainly vote to reject it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago when the original draft-UMT bill was before the House I put up the best fight I knew how to make on several of the provisions of the bill, and think I was at least partially responsible for some beneficial changes. We are now up against the gun. The draft bill expires within a few days, we are in a shooting war. The boys are still fighting and dying in Korea, and unless somebody arrives at some kind of definite objective pretty soon it looks as though they will be fighting and dying there for some time to come. The men fighting need relief, and in order to secure these necessary men and maintain our national defense to a point of safety we must have in operation a selective-service law.

I am going to vote for this conference report, but I am no more of the opinion that it is wise to combine the two at this time than I was at the time I was fighting the bill. It might be a case of deciding when is it right to do wrong. The bill has been improved over what it was when it came to the floor. I was glad to hear the chairman make the statement he did a few minutes ago about the House provision dealing with the utilization of school and college facilities, for when the language dealing with this subject was stricken out in conference I was a little bit puzzled, especially in view of the fact that one of the great educational institutions of this country very properly and appropriately conferred a doctor's degree on him recently. I thought he had walked out on the educational institutions, but he declared emphatically that he will see to it that this Congress will have the opportunity to fully consider the educational problem by amendment or otherwise, and so I think he is still entitled to hold the degree—congratulations, Doctor.

While on this subject let me say that up to now the educational people of this country have not been permitted to have very much, if anything, to do with either the drafting or planning for this all-important piece of legislation. I do not believe the Pentagon wants their ideas or will even allow the educators of this country an opportunity to help. In fact, about the only interest I have seen the military from the Pentagon exhibit in education, is in trying to get their own sons appointed to West Point, and they are usually successful in that. I think it can be truthfully said that the military

of the Pentagon are determined to subordinate our school system to the military, and I am equally determined to fight that trend. I see no reason why they cannot be coordinated, for that would prove beneficial to both. But to subordinate our school system to the military would be a long step toward the abandonment of our American way of life, and in the direction of a military dictatorship or militarism, which is just as objectionable to me as any other ism, including communism. These military leaders are not bad men, many of them are great men—men who have bared their chests to bullets in defense of this country. But they are ambitious men, and it is as much the responsibility of Congress to keep them in line and see to it that they do not usurp more power than would be good for our form of government as it is for Congress to preserve the balance between the judicial, executive, and the legislative branches of the Government. Neither should be permitted to usurp power but be required to operate within their own constitutional fields.

As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have had correspondence with many educators all over the country, including officials of elementary schools, high schools, junior colleges, colleges, and officials of the various States. The following are some of the problems that they feel, virtually without exception, should be carefully considered in the writing of a universal military training law which will unquestionably affect every segment and activity carried on in this complicated economy of ours:

First. Careful study should be given to coordinating our military program with our educational system.

Second. To continue the flow of trained personnel in all fields and especially those in the professions and sciences.

Third. To utilize to the fullest extent the faculties and teaching personnel in the junior colleges, colleges, and universities.

Fourth. To provide wherever possible summer training in camps and some military training on the campuses so as not to interrupt more than is absolutely necessary the education and training of students.

Fifth. To expand and extend the ROTC program on an equal basis for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Sixth. Wherever practicable, construct necessary buildings on the campuses of our schools, colleges, and universities rather than build entirely new camps that are strictly military.

Seventh. To study carefully the results obtained in high schools, junior colleges, and colleges, including VMI, West Point, and similar institutions where military training is carried on at the same time they are securing their academic education.

Along with these suggestions came other comments, in which I concur, indicating their extreme interest in what I regard as the finest education system on earth. I do not believe this Nation can expect to compete with such a com-

bine as the Soviet Union and its satellites in numbers alone. The strength of this Nation lies in its ability to produce equipment and weapons superior, in quality and quantity, to those of any of our enemies, or any combination of them. Under well-trained and well-informed leadership I believe our schools, colleges, and universities should be considered in the same way we consider our industrial structure and converted for production of well-trained technicians and scientists in the same way our plants are converted to produce weapons and equipment, insofar as it is consistent with our educational system. The utilization of our schools and colleges to the fullest extent is not only sound from a training standpoint, but also from an economic standpoint. The most irreplaceable defense resource is not the atom bomb but the scientist who makes it, and the fact that our schools and colleges are primary assets in the arsenal of democracy is only a natural extension of that phrase. It is proclaimed from the pulpit, the White House, by the press, and virtually every public speaker of any note that the country needs moral and spiritual strength as well as military and economic strength—and that it is essential to the defense of our freedoms to have an informed, intelligent, and resourceful people who have an awareness of our national obligations, capacities, and commitments, and certainly without full utilization of our educational institutions this goal can never be achieved. The educational people of America are willing to cooperate. I hope the military of the Pentagon will exhibit a desire to cooperate with them, but if they are unwilling to fully cooperate—then Congress should step in and see to it that they do.

If you will recall, I fought the 18½-year-old provision, but at that time I said that in case of all-out war or absolute necessity certainly we would say go to 18½ or 80 at the other end of the line if necessary, and this bill contains a provision that they will not take the 18½-year-olds until the others are exhausted.

I did not like the \$30 per month pay provision. The American people are willing to pay the premium and they are able to pay the premium on the insurance policy that might be necessary to protect this Nation. This is not the place to try to save. We should stop some of these wasteful contracts that are now feeding the flames of inflation. I think it is inexcusable for us to make the distinction we are making. As I said a moment ago, I did not like the joining together of the two bills. It is difficult for me to conceive of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, able as he is, and having done the fine work he has in this House for these many years, to have abandoned the duty of writing a universal military training bill and agree to let a commission be set up to write the bill. Of course the military is delighted to have this heavy job assigned them. It is a case of throwing the rabbit in a briar patch.

I think we have abandoned our responsibility a little bit too early but when

we go back and think of the original bill, I am definitely of the opinion that when the military wrote that bill and presented it to the Committee on Armed Services, it was the boldest and most brazen stroke for dictatorial powers ever made on the continent of the United States. In effect I said the same thing before the Committee on Armed Services, and that committee, in its wisdom and under the leadership of its great chairman, ignored many of the things that were written in it. You say, "Well, why mention it now?" I mention it simply because it is indicative of a trend in the minds of men that we must guard carefully as we do other departments of this Government, and I have said before that they are ambitious men. I respect them, I trust them, but I want them to respect the rights of my people as well as myself.

It must be remembered that in the original bill there was a provision for the President to appoint a five-man commission to draw up a UMT bill and report it to the Armed Services Committee, who were not to have the right to amend or change it. And if reported to the House, the House of Representatives was not to have the right to amend or change it—and that was not all, if the Congress did nothing it would become law without even the approval of Congress or the signature of the President. I could not think of a more horrible and dangerous precedent for the Congress to set. Now, this proposal was not just made by the military, but was adopted by the House Committee on Armed Services and reported to the House, and was not changed by the committee—until after a bitter attack had been made on this provision by myself, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and others. Then after a careful check had been made of the membership when the Committee on Armed Services found it could only rally approximately 140 votes for it out of 435 Members of the House, the chairman then announced he would offer an amendment that would give the House an opportunity to consider, amend or change the report of the Commission. I make this statement simply for the purpose of keeping the record straight. The chairman did offer the amendment, it was adopted, and is now carried in this conference report. I might say further if it were not in this report I most certainly would not vote for this conference report.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is plain from the nature of the conference report that the House is being asked to concur in today that the House conferees know only how to make war. They know nothing and care less about mitigating the suffering of those men who have fought our previous wars.

Item 26 of the conference report reads something like this:

The House amendment provided that no physician or dentist engaged in full-time employment at a Veterans' Administration hospital would be inducted, under the provisions of law authorizing the induction

of physicians and dentists, after such physician or dentist attained his thirtieth birthday.

The Senate bill contained no comparable language. The House receded from its position and agreed to the elimination of the provision from the conference report.

You will recall that just a few weeks ago when this legislation passed the House that the amendment sponsored by me was approved unanimously. It was offered as an amendment to the Barden substitute and approved practically unanimously. It was accepted without a vote as part of the original bill itself. Not a single one of the members of the committee of conference who have spoken this morning have offered one iota of explanation as to why the unanimous will of the House should be rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, the gentleman has 5 minutes remaining and I am expecting an explanation from him when the time comes.

Mr. VINSON. I will give it to the gentleman now.

Mr. BAILEY. But not on my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, without going into any of the details because they are fresh in your minds, that it was proven conclusively to the satisfaction of the House that the armed services are today raiding the medical staffs of your veterans' hospitals. Out of 4,020 members of the medical staffs in 140 hospitals 2,040 of them are reservists and over 500 of them have today already been called into service. I made the statement, in discussing the amendment when I presented it, that unless something was done half of your veterans' hospitals would be closed by the 1st of January 1951. There are 21 new veterans' hospitals under construction at the present time that will cost \$317,000,000, and there is not a doctor in sight to man a single one of them. I ask you if we can justify that from the standpoint of economy, to say nothing about the service that thousands of veterans are demanding right now and pleading for admission to the hospitals. Yet, apparently this did not get even serious consideration from the conferees. I have spoken to two members of the conference committee and they said they were not present when that action was taken. I spoke to a number of Senate conferees and they said, "You better talk to your House boys about it." So, apparently the action to leave out this amendment was initiated by our own conferees despite the unanimous vote of the House. I am not exactly ready to accuse anyone of bad faith but I think that the distinguished chairman of this committee, who still has 5 minutes to conclude this argument, if he expects my vote in support of this report, had better offer a more logical explanation than anybody has offered so far as to why that amendment was left out.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to advise the House why the conferees agreed to the elimination of what was referred to as the Bailey amendment. The amendment offered

by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] would have exempted physicians and dentists from the doctors' draft law if they were over 30 years of age and if they were employed on a full-time basis at a veterans' hospital. The Senate conferees objected to the provision on the ground that it was discriminatory and would have provided an exemption for one group of doctors and dentists in veterans' hospitals and would not protect the hundreds of civilian hospitals which likewise must be maintained and staffed throughout the Nation. For that reason, the House conferees agreed to eliminate it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is a question which apparently has caused quite a bit of consternation, almost, in the West. On page 10, in the thirteenth line, the words "subject to order" have been inserted by the committee of conference instead of the words "subject to call." No reference to the change is made in the report, and it could be very important.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from California that in reexamining the law it was concluded that in the act of 1943 when we used the word "call" it was not the proper word to use, for this reason: You only call into military service the militia or National Guard in the event of threatened invasion as all other times all components are "ordered" to active duty. Therefore, we used the word "order" instead of the word "call." There is no hidden meaning in it. It is just using the proper word to carry out a proper method of placing people on active duty.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman here or in the Record make a definite statement that the word "order" is limited to his present definition of it on the floor? The word "order" unfortunately goes way beyond that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the UMT and the Selective Service Act is now before us for consideration. This conference report is the result of a compromise between the House and Senate bills. There are many points about this measure that I do not like.

I note that there are no work camps for conscientious objectors, as was the case during World War II, and I am informed that the reason for this is that the number of conscientious objectors is so small—approximately 12,000—that it is not enough to warrant the creation of national work camps to place them in during the 24 months of their service. The conferees have arrived at a compromise on the question of conscientious objectors which leaves the question at the local level and permits draft boards to defer a person who is engaged in work

which contributes to the maintenance of national health, safety, and interest for a period of 24 months. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that this gives a great advantage to conscientious objectors over men who are inducted into the service. A man is inducted into the Army for 24 months' service and, upon discharge, remains in the Reserves for 6 years. Conscientious objectors, on the other hand, after 24 months of useful work, owe no further responsibility under the bill. This, I maintain, is decidedly unfair to those who are inducted into the service. Then there is the question of the Mennonites, who have been causing a great deal of concern in various parts of my State of Montana, and have been the result of considerable correspondence to me on the subject. I have urged the House Armed Services Committee to give this matter every possible consideration and to work out a solution which could be workable and which would not put to disadvantage those who were inducted into the service. However, as I understand this conference report, the Mennonites are given a straight deferment after induction and an assignment to work at a local level. They would be permitted the privilege of continuing in their normal occupation of farming, for example, and perhaps be able to acquire additional lands and generally improve their economic status, while boys in the same farm communities are called upon to abandon their farms and even sell their livestock at a forced sale when livestock is not ready for market. This, as you can well understand, and justifiably so, creates a great deal of feeling. I had hoped the conference report would permit draft boards, or whoever made decisions in such instances, to see to it that the conscientious objectors who are granted deferments and have the benefits already described would at least be required to do work that is definitely in the national interest and not work which merely improves their economic status and their own pocketbooks. While the Mennonites are conscientious, hard-working people, they do not contribute to the Armed Forces of the United States in time of national emergency. These people, like the rest of the population, should expect that their normal activities would be sacrificed to some extent in the national interest so that they would not be avoiding all national service.

I wish to express the hope that the Armed Forces Committee will be able to work out a program whereby those who obtain deferment on these grounds may be made more useful in contributing to the national interest during this emergency. The present report does not commend itself to the average person.

Another question of concern to me, which I think is inadequately dealt with in this report, and to which I would like to offer an amendment which is not possible under the procedure covering the reporting of a conference report, would be to lower the terms of service of reservists from 17 to 12 months. It dismays me that the enlistment of reservists is being extended. Many of them now have families and many have established

themselves in businesses and many served from 2 to 5 years in the last war. It is my hope that the Armed Services Committee will immediately look into the possibility of releasing those who have served overseas so that those who have carried the burden of World War II, are not required to carry a further and additional burden. I am informed that there are approximately 600,000 reservists in the service at the present time. The only program under which reservists now in service can be released is by calling more reservists who have already served. This is manifestly unfair and should not be allowed to continue. I understand that under the program which the Department of Defense has approved, that all reservists who served more than 12 months in World War II will be released within 12 months in the case of the Army and Air Force and after 12 months if trained replacements are available in the case of the Navy. The chairman of the House Armed Services Committee informs me that the committee has been conducting hearings for several weeks on the Reserves program. I sincerely hope that out of these hearings will come a directive that men who served more than 12 months in World War II should not be called back to active duty short of an all-out emergency that would require their additional service. I am glad to have the assurances of the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], that under the rotation program in Korea, men are going to be rotated at the rate of 20,000 a month and that most of the hardship cases will be alleviated in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, I am also glad to note that the provision, whereby aliens who, up to now, have not been forced to serve even though they are within the age group and have to register, has been done away with and that these people will have to take their part in the defense of our country.

In conclusion, I would like to again call to the attention of the Armed Services Committee the possibility of doing away with the classification of IV-F and the imposition of equal sacrifice in selective service. There are many IV-F's who could serve in some capacity in the Armed Forces of the Nation. Furthermore, the equality of sacrifice should, with extremely rare and extraordinary exceptions, be applied to all without regard to educational qualifications or abilities.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I realize as I rise to close this debate that this is a historic hour in the life of the Congress. This is a question which has been debated throughout the length and breadth of the country for 30 years. It has received as much attention and as much thought as any question that I believe the Congress has ever attempted to legislate upon.

We are in the closing hour of the handling of this bill, and the action we take today will finally lead to the adoption of

this proposal and the sending of this matter to the White House for the President's signature.

While this conference report does not contain what I would like to have it contain, and I dare say that I speak the unanimous opinion of all the Members of the House, nonetheless it has my support and approval.

In reference to the universal military training that we have adopted the House view and went almost the whole length of the House view in presenting this program to you today. I look at this, Mr. Speaker, as being the action on a measure which will give us a permanent Military Establishment that we can depend upon in good and bad times. I look at this measure, Mr. Speaker, as being the means of building up our Reserves, so that the Military Establishment will not in times of war ascend the mountain peaks of power; and then when the war is over go down into the valleys and quagmires again to abandon real defense. If this report is adopted and the bill sent on for the signature of the President, we will have a Military Establishment which will not fluctuate with the crises throughout the world. We will have a Military Establishment that we can depend upon. Someone has said that the conferees are interested in war. I tell you, as one of the conferees, I am interested in peace. And in my judgment we can only have peace by having a tremendously strong Military Establishment. This bill will give us the authority for a strong Reserve Military Establishment which the Nation needs so badly at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the universal military training provision will mean that we will have a Reserve Establishment which will not fluctuate, depending upon conditions throughout the world. The Reserve Establishment, it is true, will have some element of compulsion in it, but it will give us a strong, dependable, efficient, and well-organized Reserve throughout the country.

I have spent as much time as any Member of the House working on the Reserve problem. It is a most knotty problem. In my judgment it is one of the hardest problems that we have in the Defense Department today. By the adoption of this conference report we will make it possible to help solve this problem in the future. I am interested in two things in the Reserve. First, that the present situation shall not repeat itself, and secondly, in removing, if it is possible at this late hour, to do so, the injustices, inequities, and unfair situations which have been visited on our Reserves and our Reserve Establishment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why the House conferees backed up and took off the commission for universal military training the Reserve officer? Under this conference report we are going to have two Regular Army officers.

Mr. BROOKS. The conferees did this. They required—and I think this is important, and I certainly fought for it—a civilian to be chairman. I think that is extremely important. They required

three civilians, and one of those may be a Reserve officer.

Mr. GROSS. No, no.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me proceed, if I may, and then I will be glad to answer any questions.

In handling the Reserve question, we in the House, wanted the reservists, whether they were inactive or voluntary reservists, when they were veterans, to be released after 12 months of service. I think that was asking for much. The Armed Forces wanted them retained for 24 months, which was 12 months more than the House bill. In other words, it is twice as much as the House was willing to go along with. The law at the present time requires them to serve as long as 21 months. What we did was to scale off 4 months and reduce the time 21 months to 17 months. So that in the compromise—the reservists saved 4 months of possible service under the present law. But they also are required to serve 5 months more than we in the House hoped they would have to serve.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. GAVIN. In view of the fact that you say the conferees respected the will of the House, I want to point out that the will of the House was 12 months. The Senate had nothing in their bill. Therefore, why did not the House conferees hold out for 12 months rather than permit the other body to raise it to 17 months? We all know that a grave injustice has been done to the reservists. Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. BROOKS. I will explain my own views, at least. I thought they should not have been kept in even for 12 months. But we had to meet the exigencies of this situation. Before the reserve committee of the Committee on Military Affairs, which is now holding hearings, we have a program for the discharge of all of these reservists. I say to you that under the program given to us many of them, tens of thousands of them, should be released far before the time set in this law. We wanted an over-all limit beyond which the reservist could not be kept and this over-all limit will guarantee that they shall not be kept beyond that time, except in extreme cases.

In the program before the Armed Service subcommittee on reservists, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] was present, and I want to point out that he is a very active and ardent worker who has the interest of the reservists at heart—as I have—as I say, in the program presented to us they told us that all of the enlisted and officer personnel and volunteer and organized reservists, too, of the Marine Corps will be discharged within 13 months, which is a far better break than they would get under this bill. I hope that the releases proceed even better than promised.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I have today inserted into this RECORD the release of the Defense Department showing the program for the release of reservists. I hope that everyone interested will study this program and, by being familiar with its contents, may help to give

our Reserves on active duty some idea of when they may be released back to their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I have led the fight for the reservists. I know what injustices and hardships they have suffered over being recalled to active service after their part in the Second World War. My deep regret is that I have not been able at an earlier date to give them more hope and more help in meeting these problems.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 41, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—339

Aandahl	Chudoff	Granger
Abbitt	Church	Grant
Abernethy	Clemente	Green
Addonizio	Clevenger	Greenwood
A'bert	Cole, Kans.	Gregory
Allen, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Hagen
Allen, La.	Colmer	Hale
Andersen	Combs	Hall
H. Carl	Cooley	Edwin Arthur
Anderson, Calif.	Cooper	Hall
Andersen	Corbett	Leonard W.
August H.	Cotton	Halleck
Andrews	Coudert	Hand
Anfuso	Cunningham	Harden
Arends	Curtis, Nebr.	Hardy
Armstrong	Dague	Harris
Aspinall	Davis, Ga.	Harrison, Va.
Auchincloss	Davis, Tenn.	Hart
Ayres	Davis, Wis.	Harvey
Baker	Dawson	Havener
Bakewell	Deane	Hays, Ark.
Barden	DeGraffenried	Hays, Ohio
Baring	Delaney	Hébert
Barrett	Dempsey	Heffernan
Bates, Ky.	Denny	Heller
Bates, Mass.	Denton	Herlong
Battle	Devereux	Herter
Beall	D'Ewart	Heselton
Beckworth	Dollinger	Hess
Belcher	Dolliver	Hill
Bender	Dondero	Hillings
Bennett, Fla.	Donohue	Hinshaw
Bennett, Mich.	Donovan	Hoeven
Bentsen	Dorn	Holfield
Berry	Doyle	Holmes
Betts	Eaton	Hope
Blackney	Eberharter	Horan
Boggs, Del.	Elliott	Howell
Bolling	Ellsworth	Hunter
Bolton	Elston	Irving
Bonner	Engle	Jackson, Calif.
Bosone	Fallon	Jackson, Wash.
Bramblett	Feighan	James
Breen	Fellows	Jarman
Brehm	Fenton	Javits
Brooks	Fernandez	Jensen
Brown, Ga.	Fine	Johnson
Brown, Ohio	Fisher	Jones, Ala.
Bryson	Fogarty	Jones
Buckley	Forand	Hamilton C.
Budge	Ford	Jones
Burdick	Forrester	Woodrow W.
Burleson	Frazier	Judd
Burnside	Fulton	Karsten, Mo.
Burton	Furcolo	Kean
Bush	Gamble	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Garmatz	Keating
Camp	Gary	Kelly, N. Y.
Canfield	Gathings	Keogh
Cannon	Gavin	Kerr
Carlyle	George	Kersten, Wis.
Case	Goodwin	King
Celler	Gordon	Kirwan
Chatham	Gore	Klein
Chelf	Graham	Kluczynski
Chenoweth	Granahan	Lane

Lanham	Patten	Smith, Miss.
Lantaff	Patterson	Smith, Va.
Larcade	Perkins	Spence
Latham	Phillips	Springer
Lesinski	Pickett	Staggers
Lind	Polk	Steed
Lovre	Potter	Stefan
Lucas	Price	Stigler
McConnell	Priest	Stockman
McCormack	Prouty	Sutton
McCulloch	Quinn	Taber
McDonough	Rabaut	Tackett
McGrath	Radwan	Talle
McGregor	Rains	Teague
McGuire	Ramsay	Thomas
McKinnon	Reams	Thompson,
McMillan	Reece, Tenn.	Mich.
McMullen	Rees, Kans.	Thompson, Tex.
Machrowicz	Regan	Thornberry
Mack, Ill.	Rhodes	Tollefson
Mack, Wash.	Ribicoff	Towe
Madden	Richards	Trimble
Mahon	Riehlman	Van Pelt
Mansfield	Riley	Van Zandt
Martin, Iowa	Rivers	Vaughn
Martin, Mass.	Roberts	Vinson
Meader	Rodino	Vorys
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Colo.	Vursell
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Fla.	Walter
Mills	Rogers, Mass.	Watts
Mitchell	Rogers, Tex.	Weichel
Morano	Rooney	Welch
Morgan	Roosevelt	Wharton
Morrison	Sadlak	Wheeler
Multer	St. George	Whitaker
Mumma	Sasser	Whitten
Murdock	Saylor	Wickersham
Murphy	Schwabe	Widnall
Murray, Tenn.	Scott, Hardie	Wigglesworth
Nelson	Scott,	Williams, Miss.
Nicholson	Hugh D., Jr.	Williams, N. Y.
Norblad	Scrivner	Willis
Norrell	Scudder	Wilson, Tex.
O'Brien, Ill.	Secrest	Wolcott
O'Brien, Mich.	Seely-Brown	Wolverton
O'Neill	Sheppard	Woodruff
Ostertag	Sieminski	Yates
O'Toole	Sikes	Yorty
Paseman	Simpson, Pa.	Zablocki
Patman	Sittler	

NAYS—41

Adair	Golden	Reed, N. Y.
Allen, Ill.	Gross	Robeson
Bailey	Hull	Shafer
Beamer	Jenison	Short
Bishop	Jenkins	Simpson, Ill.
Bray	Jonas	Smith, Wis.
Brownson	McVey	Vail
Buffett	Marshall	Velde
Busbey	Mason	Werdell
Butler	Morris	Wier
Chipfield	O'Hara	Wilson, Ind.
Crumpacker	Philbin	Withrow
Curtis, Mo.	Powell	Wood, Idaho
Doughton	Rankin	

NOT VOTING—52

Angell	Harrison, Wyo.	Moulder
Blatnik	Hedrick	Murray, Wis.
Boggs, La.	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Konski
Bow	Hoffman, Mich.	Poage
Boykin	Jones, Mo.	Poulson
Byrne, N. Y.	Kearns	Preston
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Redden
Cox	Kennedy	Reed, Ill.
Crawford	F'lburn	Sabath
Crosser	Kilday	Sheehan
Dingell	LeCompte	Shelley
Durham	Lyle	Smith, Kans.
Evins	McCarthy	Stanley
Flood	Magee	Taylor
Fugate	Marrow	Winstead
Gillette	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
Gossett	Miller, N. Y.	
Gwinn	Morton	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Smith of Kansas against.

Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Polk with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Harrison of Wyoming.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Fugate with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. O'TOOLE and Mr. TACKETT changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on Senate bill No. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DENNIS CARDINAL DOUGHERTY

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, today there will be laid to rest in Philadelphia the earthly remains of the distinguished and beloved prelate, Dennis Cardinal Dougherty. Since the passing of Cardinal Dougherty many thousands of grief-stricken people have attended the last viewing. This unprecedented outpouring of people of all ages and creeds from all sections of his diocese testifies to the deep affection and respect in which Cardinal Dougherty was held by all who knew him, or had felt the influence of his work for civic and spiritual good. His community, his friends, and his church will long remember his great qualities of mind and heart and spirit.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4329) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4329, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, general debate had been concluded.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That there are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, out of (1) the general fund of the District of Columbia, hereinafter known as the general fund, such fund being composed of the revenues of the District of Columbia other than those applied by law to special funds, and \$11,000,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1951), (2) highway funds, established by law (D. C. Code, title 47, ch. 19), and (3) the water fund, established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), and \$1,000,000 which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1951), sums as follows:

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of discussing a problem that I think is of interest to this Committee and to the Congress, as well as to the people of the District of Columbia. In my opinion, it is appropriate during the consideration of the bill giving the funds for the operation of the District of Columbia government to inquire into what is being done to clean up the transportation system in the city of Washington.

For the past year and a half it is certainly obvious to even the most casual observer that the Capital Transit Co. has ceased to have as its primary objective the serving of the public, and now its objective is to earn money for the owners. In my judgment, some effective action should be taken to assure that the Public Utilities Commission of the District, for whom funds are provided in this bill, represent more nearly the public interest. It seems to me that they have been misled by the self-serving statements to the Commission by the Capital Transit Co.

As recently as December 20, 1949, following a wage arbitration settlement with the employees, the company issued a statement to the effect that regardless of the increase in fares, the company would continue to show a loss, since fares could not be increased to a point high enough to pay dividends without suffering a more than corresponding loss in patronage. The Capital Transit Co. was granted an increased fare to 15 cents and recently, on May 29, it was reported in the press that the Capital Transit Co.'s net income for the first 4 months of this year was over a half million dollars. This compared with a \$62,000 net income for the comparable period the year before.

The new ownership, composed of a group of businessmen from another State, has produced not only a net profit for themselves by means of rate increases, service cuts, reductions in force, and the elimination of routes, but, as well, have experienced an increase in the value of their stock shares.

An article in a Washington newspaper recently summarized the stock profits of the new owners as follows:

The new owners bought the Capital Transit stock at only \$20 a share. Capital Transit has 240,000 shares of common stock and the new owners now hold about 55 percent control of the company as well as active control of the management. The current market

value of the stock is around \$35 a share. Thus the new owners in a year and a half have about doubled their money.

In addition it might be said that this new group of owners has gradually taken over the top paying management jobs in the company. It seems to me that it is about time that we have an effective Public Utilities Commission in the District. Certainly there is something wrong with a system that will permit the public to be gouged for additional fares while forced to tolerate reduced service and, at the same time, the company is exceeding all previous profits as well as increased stock values.

The new management of the company was entirely without transportation experience. An editorial in the Sunday Star of September 4, 1949 entitled "Absentee Transit Ownership" pointed out:

A group of nine investors, none of them living in Washington and none of them having shown previous interest in the transportation field, is now in position to consummate its purchase of a controlling share of the Capital Transit Co.

The editorial further pointed out that it was clear that the purchase was considered as an investment as the only motive of the purchase of this company.

No one can deny the experience of the present ownership in making money. The majority stockholder in the company is reputed to have snowballed a \$5,000 loan made in 1932 to a fortune of \$10,000,000 in 1949. He apparently has a lot of surplus cash because he testified before the Kefauver committee and I quote from a summary of his testimony issued by the Congressional Library.

When Wolfson entered the campaign—

Governor Fuller Warren of Florida—

It was agreed that he would carry the bulk of the expenses along with C. V. Griffin and William H. Johnston. Wolfson was vaguely aware of Johnston's horse and dog race track interest but was ignorant of the Florida law barring persons connected with race tracks from making political contributions.

According to the summary, Mr. Wolfson further stated that he contributed \$150,000 to that gubernatorial campaign.

I intend to go into this matter further of the affairs of the Capital Transit particularly with regard to the manner in which the Public Utilities Commission has permitted the public to become a pawn in a monstrous financial manipulation of speculators controlling this vital system in the Capital of our Nation.

I would appreciate it if the gentlemen of the committee could tell me to what extent this has been explored before giving the appropriations for the carrying on of the functions of the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Any person who has been riding on the busses and streetcars in this city today knows that they just keep crowding them in and crowding them in, old people and women and children, and the driver will shout, "Step back in the bus. Step back in the bus." And he will practically shut the

door on people. I had the door shut on me just the other day. They give no consideration to the public whatever. Yet they raise rates and then declare dividends.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from New York makes a very valid and important observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, just what part of the bill is the gentleman addressing himself to?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Kansas is addressing this Committee with respect to funds expended under this bill, a part of which is used to pay the salaries and expenses of the Utilities Commission of the District, who in turn have a considerable amount of authority in dealing with the Capital Transit Co. that I am presently discussing. I trust the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, an industrious member of this Committee, will not only listen to what I have to say, but will give this particular problem the consideration to which I think it is entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$11,000,000" and insert "\$9,800,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel flattered. Perhaps the gentleman from Indiana thinks that my speaking for an additional 5 minutes might defeat him. I refer, of course, to my amendment, which he opposes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. If the gentleman's remarks are so important, I do not see why he does not go on with his little story.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, in a period such as we are in now, when it is necessary to watch the expenditures of the Federal Government more carefully than ever, I personally cannot see why we should raise the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia by \$1,200,000 this year.

My amendment, if agreed to by the House, would give the District exactly the same Federal contribution for 1952 that the Congress gave it for fiscal year 1951. At the outset I want to make it clear that like many Members of this House I personally pay real-estate and

personal-property taxes in the District of Columbia. I have very little fault to find with the allocations made in the bill, but I do object strenuously to the low-tax rates on real estate and personal property in the District which compel the 48 States, almost all of which have higher taxes, to contribute more than they should to the operation of the District of Columbia.

Let us compare the taxes of three comparable cities—Boston, San Francisco, and Washington. Boston, with a population of 790,000, collected nearly \$90,000,000 in taxes from real estate the past year. San Francisco, with a population only 30,000 less than Washington, D. C., levied nearly \$53,000,000 against real estate. What do we find in the case of Washington, with a similar population? In Washington the real-estate tax is slightly less than \$36,000,000. In other words, San Francisco property owners pay at least 50 percent more than the property owners pay here in Washington, D. C., while the property owners in Boston, the home of the great majority leader of this house, pay two and one-half times as much as the people in this highly favored District of Columbia.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield; my time was limited by a Member on the Republican side. I am sorry to say, and I have no time to give to the gentleman, much as I would like to do so.

Is it fair to bring in this request for an increase in the Federal contribution over last year when in the other appropriation bills which have cleared the House during this session the amounts have been decreased? This is a time when we must retrench in every way possible in Federal expenditures.

If necessary, the Commissioners of the District have the power to increase the tax rate on real estate by the small sum of 5 percent to offset this particular decrease which I am asking by this amendment, if they so see fit.

Let me reiterate, Mr. Chairman, my amendment leaves the Federal contribution at exactly the same figure the District received last year. There is no reason why the taxpayers in my State of Minnesota and other States throughout the country, already burdened with their own tax problems, should be called upon to contribute such a large sum for the District's benefit. Certainly Minnesota should make some contribution to the support of the Nation's Capital, Mr. Chairman, but that contribution should be held down at least to the same amount which was made by this Congress last year. The District of Columbia has one of the lowest income-tax rates in the Nation; the sales tax here is one of the most favorable in the country; we have millions of people coming here from all over the United States helping to pay the sales tax in the District of Columbia. There is no county, city, State, school district, or township tax here in the District, such as we have in Minnesota, Kansas, and practically every other State in the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to retract any derogatory remarks, if any, I may have made about my colleague from Indiana in this debate.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I object to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I should like to reach an agreement as to time for debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I object on the ground that we are otherwise being limited and we shall have to be careful to preserve our time here.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota bases his argument on the premise that this is an increase over the amount of the Federal contribution for the last fiscal year. Last year the subcommittee favorably reported and the full committee favorably reported the full amount of the authorization, \$11,000,000 for the Federal contribution plus the \$1,000,000 for the contribution to the water fund. It was cut by 10 percent by the House but that, I think, is probably the lowest that the Federal contribution has ever been since the Federal Government has been making contributions to the District of Columbia.

I would like to call the attention of the House to page 10 of the hearings. Page 10 of the hearings shows the contributions that have been made by the Federal Government since the year 1922. Percentage-wise the contribution that was made last year to the full amount of the District budget was 9.57 percent, less than 10 percent of the full amount of the budget, the lowest contribution made since the practice was inaugurated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask every Member of the House to consider one factor, and that is this: Washington is a Federal city. This is the Capital of the Nation, the center, the focal point, to which your constituents come, to which the people of the world come, to see the Government of the United States in action. You want a beautiful city for them to see, one which is well-organized, and well-run. This requires money. The amount that has been requested by this subcommittee amounts to less than 10

cents per individual in this Nation. Do you think that your constituents would object to your authorizing the payment of less than 10 cents for the upkeep of your capital? I certainly believe that they would have no such objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I cannot understand how the gentleman can say that I was in error as to the amount allowed last year. It is a matter of record, found on pages 54 and 55, April 19, I may say to the gentleman, where the House adopted the amendment to reduce last year from \$12,000,000 to \$10,800,000.

Mr. YATES. Perhaps I did not express myself as clearly as I might. I remember that we on the committee brought in the full amount of the contribution authorized because we believed it was necessary for the upkeep of the District of Columbia. As a matter of fact, I still believe it was necessary and I think the District was unduly penalized last year. We, who sit on the Committee on the District of Columbia, know that the District is pressed for funds. If this cut goes through, it will have its effect. Perhaps one of the schools to be constructed in the District of Columbia under this budget will not be built. If this cut goes into effect some of the other expenses of the District of Columbia will not be met. The request for additional police officers may not be met; the request for additional firemen may not be met. This is not comparable to the soil-conservation program that the gentleman spoke about yesterday in the committee. This is a matter where each item in the budget of this metropolitan community is earmarked. In the event you do make this cut, it is going to result in loss of service to the people of this community, one which they cannot make up.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. What about this comparative tax rate?

Mr. YATES. The comparative tax rate has this to be said about it. I agree with the gentleman that the District of Columbia has a tax rate that is lower than other comparable municipalities of the country. On the other hand, I suggest the gentleman take a look at the table that appears on page 45 which shows the tax rates are comparable to municipalities in other parts of the country. The taxes paid compare favorably with other communities. The gentleman from Minnesota failed to point out this, that the people of the District of Columbia, in addition to paying this real-estate tax, pay a personal-property tax; they pay an income tax and they pay a sales tax. The municipalities in other sections of the country do not pay them. I know in my home city of Chicago we have no city sales tax. The District of Columbia does have such a sales tax. In the city of Chicago we have no income tax. The District of Columbia has such an income tax.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this Capital City has been through crisis after crisis, and handicapped as it is by the lack of real power it has fulfilled its obligation to house and protect as well as provide essential hospital, school, sewer, water, and other city facilities for thousands upon thousands of Federal employees.

These employees are from your State and mine.

This city has more than 19,000 employees, and it is not a municipal corporation composed of a clerical and official staff born and reared in the District of Columbia.

Like Federal departments, its employees almost entirely come from the registers of the Civil Service Commission; many thousands from the various States, with reserved home ties and voting privileges. Many do not even live within the confines of the District of Columbia.

I point these facts out so that you might understand how different this city is as compared with others in the States. Here is your city, our city, the Nation's city, with functions usually assumed by State and county all combined with the city functions.

The broad avenues, magnificent parks, and great building projects all demonstrate that this is not a local community but a great National City existing for all our people.

The sovereign power in the District is lodged in the United States and it possesses full and unlimited jurisdictions both of a political and municipal nature over the District. Its supreme legislative body is Congress. Crimes committed here are not crimes against the District but crimes against the United States.

It is important to remember these facts and to reflect upon our individual responsibility.

The government of the district of Columbia is simply an agency of the United States for conducting the affairs of its government in this Federal District.

Our hearings disclosed some very interesting facts in connection with the Federal-District fiscal relationships:

The fiscal relations between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government have now reached four phases:

Between 1790 and 1878 there was no fixed system for Federal payment with a result that in some years there were lump-sum payments and in other years there were no payments at all.

During the second period from 1879 to 1924, we were on the 50-50 basis—this system being established by the act approved June 11, 1878. Notwithstanding this act of Congress, however, in making appropriations for the District for the fiscal year 1921 Congress provided for a 40-60 basis.

A similar plan appeared in the appropriations act for 1922, and then in 1923 the 40-60 basis of appropriating was made permanent law.

The next period dealt with the system of ignoring the permanent law established in 1923 for lump-sum payments,

and the District received varying amounts from 1925 through 1939.

The law establishing the 40-60 basis of appropriating was repealed by the provision of the District of Columbia Revenue Act approved May 16, 1938.

The District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939, approved July 26, 1939, authorized to be appropriated, as the annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, the sum of \$6,000,000. This was the amount of the Federal payment for each of the fiscal years 1940 through 1946. For the fiscal year 1947, the Federal payment was set at \$8,000,000. During these years and up to July 1, 1947, the water fund received no portion of the annual payments made to the District of Columbia government by the Federal Government. After exhaustive hearings by the Joint Fiscal Committee, the Congress approved the present law in reference to the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia being the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 approved July 16, 1947. Article 6 of that act provides as follows:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for each fiscal year thereafter, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, as the annual payment by the United States toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, the sum of \$12,000,000, of which \$11,000,000 shall be credited to the general fund of the District of Columbia and \$1,000,000 shall be credited to the water fund of the District of Columbia, established by law. (Title 43, ch. 15, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.)

Throughout the years, officials representing the District of Columbia have been advocating that Congress should pursue a definite policy of regular and liberal appropriations for the development and upkeep of the District commensurate with its status as the Nation's Capital. In the fiscal year of 1951, a 10-percent reduction was made in the general fund payment of \$11,000,000.

The residents of the District of Columbia have always been ready and willing to pay their share for the upkeep and operation of the Capital City. This cost is becoming astronomical. In 1917 the total cost of running the city government was approximately \$16,000,000. In 1945 the total cost was approximately \$69,901,000, and for the fiscal year 1952 it will be in the neighborhood of \$138,000,000.

When you think of these astounding increases and compare them with the table of Federal payments, you cannot help but feel that there is an inequitable situation in the fiscal relationship existing between the sovereign Federal Government and the municipal corporation which it created.

I think it might be appropriate to invite attention to the land problem in the District of Columbia. Here we are in a different situation from the usual municipality. We are in an area that is fixed—we are territorially limited—we cannot expand. The total land area of the District excluding streets is approximately 36,873 acres and less than 50 percent is taxable.

When the Federal Government purchases property, the tax revenue previously received on such property is lost to the District—it cannot be replaced—can never be replaced. Residents of the District of Columbia are required and expected to make up such loss in revenues by increased taxes.

There has been a tremendous expansion of the Federal Government in the last 10 or 15 years. In addition to property federally owned, we have the terrific impact of privately owned tax-exempt property. Foreign governments, for embassy and legation purposes, own large and valuable holdings within this District which are exempt from the payment of taxes for real estate. Large national organizations have secured acts of Congress specifically exempting them from real-estate taxes. The future program already approved looks toward an ever-increasing tax-exempt roll.

While thinking in terms of real estate, reference might also be made to the ever-enlarging development of park areas in the District. The National Zoological Park, which is indeed a National park, under the control of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, is maintained and operated solely from District funds. Much of Rock Creek Park was acquired with District funds, and approximately \$12,000,000 has been spent, and an additional \$4,000,000 authorized to be spent, under the provisions of the Capper-Cramton Act, May 29, 1930, and all the land so acquired throughout the years by the Federal Government with District money is titled in the United States of America. The policing of these parks is at District expense, the maintenance and upkeep of these parks are at District expense. Congress has certainly been conscious of its responsibility for the development of the parks in a manner befitting the Nation's Capital and for the people of all the States in the Union.

All of these matters herein referred to were fully surveyed, discussed, and considered before the Joint Fiscal Committee which considered the revenue bill of 1947, and nowhere in the report is there an indication that the \$12,000,000 is anywhere near the maximum amount which the District should expect by way of equitable payment. We requested and received the following information:

First. Special police details for specific Federal and kindred purposes:

- (a) Performed by Metropolitan Police.
- (b) Estimated annual cost, \$180,000.

Second. Responses to fires in Federal buildings, washing and pumping out flooded Federal buildings, special details, and fire fighting and prevention instruction given Federal personnel:

- (a) Performed by the Fire Department.
- (b) Estimated annual cost, \$75,000.

Third. Temporary home for ex-soldiers and ex-sailors:

- (a) Performed by Public Welfare.
- (b) Estimated annual cost, \$29,000.

Fourth. Installing of curbs and gutters abutting Federal property:

- (a) Performed by Highway Department.
- (b) Estimated annual cost, \$50,000.

Fifth. Issuing motor-vehicle license plates and title certificates for Federal and diplomatic vehicles and congressional tags for special parking privileges:

- (a) Performed by Department of Vehicles and Traffic.
- (b) Estimated annual cost, \$30,000.

Sixth. Cleaning streets abutting Federal property and refuse collection and disposal:

- (a) Performed by Refuse Division.
- (b) Estimated annual cost, \$134,000.

Seventh. Handling and treating sewage from Federal property:

- (a) Performed by Sewer Division.
- (b) Estimated annual cost, \$165,000.

Eighth. Water furnished Federal agencies:

- (a) Performed by Washington Aqueduct and Water Division.
- (b) Estimated annual cost, \$1,200,000.

Ninth. National organizations located in Nation's Capital, legations, embassies, and other privately owned property exempt from tax with a total value of \$151,296,000 would produce \$3,250,000 in taxes.

Tenth. If taxed, Federal property would produce approximately \$18,000,000.

Eleventh. Expenses of National Capital Parks and Planning Commission, \$96,400.

Twelfth. Expenses of National Zoological Park, \$591,000.

Thirteenth. Land purchased and to be purchased and titled in the United States under the Capper-Cranston Act, \$16,000,000.

Fourteenth. Improvements, maintenance, and policing nationally owned parks, \$1,000,000.

Fifteenth. District of Columbia share of the hospital center \$7,500,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

In rising to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, I do not overlook the merits of many of the arguments advanced in favor of such a tax. I simply state to you that we face realism at the moment. We face the fact that the Federal Government has no money. We face the fact that the food dollar has fallen to 42 cents and may still be falling, influenced by the budget for fiscal year 1952. We face the fact that every month during the current fiscal year more bonds have been redeemed than have been purchased by the people of the United States. This may seem like a small item in the proposed saving, but we are down to small items.

I say respectfully to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and all others who are supporting this subvention to the District, that while the amount we are saving is very small, the District has not yet raised its own taxes to a comparable figure with other cities. For example, the sales tax rate in the District of Columbia is 2 cents. The sales tax in California, which also taxes by that method, because of the large number of nonproperty-owning visitors, is

2½ percent. In addition, the municipalities in many States—I think in Chicago—

Mr. YATES. The State legislature prohibited the city from undertaking it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I commend your legislature, because the municipalities are taking up that tax, and thus duplicating a tax levy. In my own State, in some cities, a visitor would pay 3½-percent sales tax. The District has an unusual situation with so many visitors, and it seems to me a sales tax is a logical tax to levy here. Bringing it to the customary tax would make up more than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] is asking to take off.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One of the other gentlemen made the statement in argument against my amendment that it would result in a certain school not being constructed. If that gentleman would turn to the committee report, on page 2, he would see where the subcommittee itself states that even with what is given in this bill there will be a net surplus of receipts over expenditures of \$3,200,000, and if the cut proposed in my amendment goes into effect they will still have \$2,000,000, which is not even allocated. So I cannot see how that school argument can hold water in view of the testimony of the subcommittee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is properly calling attention to the fallacy of the argument that no agency of Government can spend money except the Federal Government. If the Federal Government cannot spend money, then let the burden of taxation be laid upon sources not yet taxed equally with similar sources in other municipalities. That applies to both real-estate and sales taxes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. As a matter of fact, the gentleman referred to the committee report. That is estimated surplus that may occur in the event that the figures work out as is estimated. The point I make, however, is that we on the committee saw a list of priority items that was presented by the budget officer of the District of Columbia that must be eliminated—items that were essential to the welfare of the people of the District that had to be eliminated because they did not have enough money to do it. Among those items were several schools. That is why I say there are still on that list certain items that depend upon necessary revenues. As I recall it, one of those items is a school.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have great respect for the very able gentleman from Illinois and for all members of the subcommittee. If the taxes of the District of Columbia were raised to the equivalent tax on real estate or the sales tax in the county in which I live, we would gain not only the small amount the gentleman from Minnesota is trying to take

off, but we could eliminate most of the Federal Government subvention.

Mr. YATES. What does the gentleman believe would be a fair contribution? Is there any basis for the gentleman to state what would be a fair contribution?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Generally in the human family, when the parents are broke the children try to carry all of their own expenses. Is that the answer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is one thing we have been overlooking a little bit. If you follow the testimony of the hearings, you will realize that the Federal Government in effect cheated the District of Columbia out of \$200,000 simply on the amount of money for water that was used. In what seemed to be a rather high-handed procedure, but it is the way it is done, the United States Government used \$1,200,000 worth of water, but simply paid for \$1,000,000 worth. If you will look on page 541 of the hearings, you will find a list that itemizes the value to the Government of various services that are rendered by the District of Columbia in connection with certain property that is used and services that are rendered by the District. It comes to a great deal more than \$12,000,000. What it comes down to is that the Federal Government is not paying the District what it should. The fact of the matter is that the people of the United States, through this Government of ours, are in effect depriving the citizens of the District of Columbia of money and asking them to pay the bill for the United States Government.

The water bill is perhaps the best illustration I can give where, without regard to what was used, without regard to an obligation justly owed, without regard to honor, in effect this Congress said to the District: "We are going to use over a million dollars' worth of water, but we are not going to pay you for it. Do what you want about it."

And what can the District do? We all know that the District is more or less a stepchild of the Congress; we all know that we take very little interest in it, and such interest as we take is only because we have to. There are very few Members in this Congress, and I do not include myself as one of them, who are in there fighting for the District the way they would fight for their own district back home.

Let me give an example. I do not know how many letters you receive a week or a month from people in your district asking you to do something about hardship cases in the service, asking for the discharge of boys in the service, or the transfer of boys in the service, or things of that nature, but you must have a hundred or more a month. Have you

ever stopped to think who looks after those details for the people of the District of Columbia? They must have people in the service; they must have hardship cases, but there is no one to whom they can write, and there are not very many people to whom they can look in such matters. The same is true of this bill today.

The fact of the matter is that the District of Columbia, and the amount of money that is paid to it by the Federal Government, has been cut time after time and is being cut more than they should be in this particular bill. It comes down to the question, however, of whether or not we as citizens of this country want to pay our just bills. The fact of the matter is—and the proof is right in the hearings on page 541—the fact of the matter is that we really owe the District of Columbia a great deal more than we are paying in this \$12,000,000 item or whatever the item may be; it runs to a good many millions more than that.

Let us pay our bill; let us at least be fair with the District of Columbia. I know that the Members want to be; let us be fair.

There is not anyone here to defend the District, whereas with any other bill that comes up you find a dozen different Members object because it affects their district. I say that in this case if there is any doubt about the amount the Federal Government should contribute, we should resolve that doubt in favor of the District, because that is certainly where the equity of the situation now lies.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. YATES. When the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Minnesota was pending before the Appropriations Committee, in line with what the gentleman said, one of the members of the committee said: "This is just like taking candy from a baby." I think that is true, because the District has no representation. This being the case, we must be fair with the District.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the policies of the present defense plant expansion plan of this administration are permitted to continue it will mean the liquidation of free enterprise as we have known it in the last half-century, and complete capitulation to Government dictation over industry, with the taxpayers bearing the entire cost of this gigantic break with traditional American business methods. In 5 months the Defense Production Authority has issued certificates of necessity for \$5,000,000,000 worth of plants compared with \$7,300,000,000 for the entire period of World War II.

A small clique of individuals with no special knowledge of any industry are charged in this report with providing an "unparalleled handout of taxpayers' moneys to favored corporations."

More millionaires will be made in connection with the present emergency than have ever been made before. We are

now shoveling out the taxpayers' money in two ways: First, by financing industries so as to permit them to expand; and, second, by providing a short amortization period—5 years for investments.

This policy of feeding the big industrial fish at the expense of small business could eventually cost us the backbone of our economic system—small business. Our Government revenue is being lost by permitting the amortization of the investment on a short-term basis and the poor individual taxpayer has to make it up.

The Defense Production Administration, by its loose methods of determining who should receive loans or certificates, is offering an open invitation to all kinds of impropriety similar to that uncovered in the RFC. Common sense business policies and the avoidance of haste in granting loans and certificates should have been used by the agency to prevent needless over-expansion.

I have mentioned in several radio addresses the importance of committee work in the House and how the committee organizes itself into various subcommittees for the purposes of studying certain definite programs to develop facts and information on legislative proposals, and in many other instances to look into the operation of executive bureaus, agencies, and so forth.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has a subcommittee of eight members, five Democrats and three Republicans. This subcommittee was assigned the task of looking into the granting of certificates of necessity to expand plants and provide funds for their construction. For a month this subcommittee investigated this matter with a good staff and made a careful examination of what was going on. The subcommittee filed its findings in a report dated May 28, 1951. This report is No. 504, to the Eighty-second Congress. You may receive a copy of this report by writing to me or to the committee chairman, Congressman PORTER HARDY, Jr., House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

I want to discuss with you this report and read or quote directly from it. The facts presented, and they certainly are facts, are almost unbelievable. The opening statement on page 1, under the title of Summary, is startling enough to attract attention and create a desire to read the entire report. The opening statement says:

The certificate of necessity program is the biggest bonanza that ever came down the Government pike. In 5 months certificates have been issued for \$5,000,000,000 worth of plants. Applications are pending for many billions more, and the end is not in sight. Many businessmen have been quick to seize upon this opportunity to expand their existing facilities expecting to charge off the cost or a substantial portion of it to war profits. The \$5,000,000,000 figure for the first 5 months of the current program is to be compared with the figure of \$7,300,000,000 for the entire World War II period.

The subcommittee's inquiry into this program was prompted by (1) the tremendous amount of money involved; (2) an interest in following up the recommendation of the Brewster committee during the Eightieth

Congress that certificates of necessity gave rise to legal profiteering; and (3) the importance of accelerated tax-amortization allowance as a factor in fixing prices for defense contracts. Because of the apparent close relationship the original scope of the inquiry was expanded to include direct Government loans authorized by section 302 of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

A certificate of necessity permits a company to write off the cost of a new plant over a 5-year period instead of over the usual 20- to 25-year period. For example, if a company constructed a facility costing \$100,000, normally it would be allowed a deduction for tax-return purposes of about \$4,000 a year until the facility was fully depreciated. Under a certificate of necessity the company could be permitted to deduct \$20,000 each year for 5 years. This privilege covers the next 5-year emergency period when normal and excess-profits-tax rates can be expected to be high and company profits exceptionally good. In an actual case studied by the subcommittee, a company estimated its gross annual profits for the next 5 years at \$18,000,000 of which about \$14,000,000 each year would be exempt from taxation under the certificate of necessity issued to it.

In many respects the administration of both the certificate of necessity and direct-loan programs has been unsound and detrimental to the public interest. In the first place, the established regulations and procedures have not been followed. There are instances of outright disregard for the safeguards which were designed to protect these most vulnerable functions from abuse. The need for prompt action to meet the national emergency was construed as justifying a "shovel in the barrel" approach to the certificate of necessity program as early as 10 days after it got under way. On December 9, 1950, just 9 days after the certifying authority, the National Security Resources Board, acquired Mr. Byron O. Woodside to head up the certificate of necessity and loan programs, 48 certificates covering almost \$500,000,000 in facilities were issued to certain companies in the steel industry.

On page 16, under the title "Nature and Background of Certificates of Necessity," the report states, and I read from the report:

Ordinarily, a taxpayer is allowed to deduct on his tax return as an item of business expense for a particular year a certain amount to cover the depreciation on his plant, machinery, or equipment. The amount permitted by the Bureau of Internal Revenue varies, of course, depending upon the nature of the property, but, in general, is fixed under bulletin F according to the expected life of the facility. This estimate is controlled to a large extent by the normal physical life of the facility. Thus, a factory or industrial plant is usually depreciated over a period of 20 to 25 years, allowing the taxpayer to deduct 4 to 5 percent a year until entirely written off.

The law does make provision, however, for the allowance of extraordinary obsolescence under certain circumstances, quite aside from the emergency amortization section. It is incumbent upon the taxpayer in each case to establish to the satisfaction of the Bureau that his facility is subject to excessive depreciation and that for tax purposes he should be permitted to deduct more than the amount specified under bulletin F of the Treasury Department. However, the experience of that period clearly demonstrated the utter impracticability of such a procedure.

Let us use a hypothetical case to illustrate just how a company benefits from a certificate of necessity. A company that builds a \$100,000 plant in normal peacetime would

be permitted under the internal-revenue laws a deduction on its tax return of \$4,000 or \$5,000 each year for 20 or 25 years, as the case may be. That deduction for depreciation is considered a proper item of business expense. If, however, that same company were to construct an emergency facility it could be permitted, by force of a certificate of necessity, to deduct \$20,000 each year for 5 years. Hence, assuming for a particular year the company made a net profit, over and above all expenses except depreciation, of \$25,000 it would pay taxes if only normal depreciation were allowed on \$20,000, or \$21,000, whereas with the certificate of necessity it would pay taxes on only \$5,000. This hypothetical case is not far-fetched because in one actual case coming to the attention of the subcommittee, the company estimated its probable yearly earnings at approximately \$18,000,000, of which approximately \$14,000,000 would be retained as a tax deduction under its certificate of necessity.

The historical background of certificates of necessity affords the clearest insight to their essential nature and purpose. They were not devised as an indirect subsidy; they were devised to give the taxpayer only what he was in all equity and fairness entitled to—a proper depreciation allowance for a facility the economic useful life of which is shortened by the extraordinary conditions prevalent in times of national emergency. When it is said that certificates of necessity were intended as an incentive to private capital to build defense plants, all that properly means is that private enterprise would naturally be reluctant to invest in a war or emergency facility unless assured by a certificate of necessity that cognizance will be accorded by the Government the probability that the facility will have a comparatively short economic life. This is not to say that certificates of necessity are not a vital means of inducing expansion but it does connote that the extent to which expansion properly may be induced under certificates is definitely limited.

Now let us discuss from the report some specific cases. First, on page 9, is given the history of the Hazleton Steel & Tubing Corp. The Hazleton Steel & Tubing Corp. was chartered as a Delaware corporation on September 15, 1950. Its purpose was to build and operate a steel mill at Hazleton, Pa. The bill's product would be oil-field pipe and other oil-field tubular goods. The corporation had authorized capital stock of 1,000 shares of common stock, par value \$1, and paid-in capital of \$600 divided as follows: Mr. Benjamin S. Dowd, president of the corporation, 300 shares, \$300; Mr. Martin G. Charles, vice president and secretary, 150 shares, \$150; Mr. James H. Hopkins, vice president, 150 shares, \$150.

The only other asset of the corporation was some land near Hazleton, containing 27.7 acres. This was an abandoned race track donated to the promoters by a civic improvement group, the Hazleton Industrial Development Fund. The promoters placed a book value of \$100,000 on the land; RFC engineers later appraised it at \$13,850.

On November 15, 1950, the corporation filed an application for a certificate of necessity for \$4,275,340 to cover the cost of the proposed mill. Mr. H. B. McCoy, Chief of the Industry Operations Bureau, National Production Authority, referred the application to the Iron and Steel Division of the Industry Operations Bureau for study and report.

Under date of December 7, 1950, Dr. Frank R. Creedon, Assistant Administrator, National Production Authority, signed a recommendation that a certificate for 85 percent be issued. On December 9, 1950 the certificate was granted by NSRB.

On November 22, 1950, the corporation filed the first application for a defense loan under section 302 of the Defense Production Act. It was designated LAC-1. The amount requested was \$5,200,000. This amount was later amended; the final figure was \$7,800,000. A committee was appointed to "review all of the circumstances surrounding the proposed Hazleton loan."

On April 11, 1951, that committee reported to General Harrison that no evidence of impropriety had been found in the handling of the loan, and that the proposed steel mill was desirable for the defense program. The only thing the committee found questionable was the element of financial risk. In that connection reference was made to the fact that if financial assistance for the project were available elsewhere, a section 302 loan could not even be considered under the law. The committee recommended that the phrase "private capital" in the previous loan approved be changed to "private equity capital." DPA amended the terms of the loan accordingly and on April 26 instructed RFC, its fiscal agent, to proceed with final negotiations with the applicant.

The second specific case the subcommittee investigated was that of the Lone Star Steel Co. The facilities of the Lone Star Steel Co., Daingerfield, Tex., were built by the Defense Plant Corporation during World War II at a cost of over \$30,000,000. They were purchased by Lone Star from War Assets Administration in 1946. The plant was new and had never been in production.

The plant produced pig iron successfully and in 1948 the company planned to expand. It was proposed to add steel-mill facilities that would produce oil-field pipe, casing, and rods for the nearby oil fields in Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma. There has been a shortage of this type of tubular goods for 10 years. In January 1949, the company applied to RFC for a loan of \$74,103,000. In July 1949, RFC approved a loan of \$34,000,000 conditioned upon Lone Star Steel injecting \$22 million equity capital. RFC thought that the owners of Lone Star Steel could raise the equity capital in Texas. RFC pointed out that the stockholders, many of them wealthy men, had a relatively small amount of risk capital in the enterprise. The commitment for the RFC loan was extended until January 15, 1951, but the loan was never consummated because the \$22,000,000 equity capital was not furnished.

In early November 1950, Lone Star applied for a certificate of necessity to cover \$73,425,200 of a proposed expansion. In November 29, 1950, the iron and steel division of the Industry Operations Bureau, NPA, reported favorably on the application and recommended a certificate for 100 percent.

Mr. Frank R. Creedon, director of the facilities clearance staff, under date of December 7, 1950, recommended a certificate for \$73,425,200 at 85 percent, and on December 9, 1950, NSRB issued the certificate.

As to the economic usefulness of the facility after 5 years, Mr. Elmer Harber, chairman of the board of directors of RFC, who testified that he had been in the oil business for a great number of years, estimated the economic useful life after 5 years to be "10 or 15—maybe more."

On November 27, while the iron and steel division was considering the application for a certificate of necessity, Lone Star filed with RFC an application for a loan of \$82,000,000 under section 302 of the Defense Production Act. The loan was to cover the same expansion previously planned, the larger amount being due to a rise in construction costs during the 2 years which had elapsed.

In January 1951 several conferences were held between representatives of RFC, NPA, and DPA. RFC felt that it could not make the whole loan under section 302 of the Defense Production Act. Mr. Frank Williams,

RFC Washington loan examiner, testified that the company estimated that under the certificate of necessity each year for 5 years the company could charge off on the loan \$14,685,000 of an estimated net income of \$18,525,000. RFC estimated the net income at \$9,000,000. If the RFC estimate is correct the company would pay no income tax at all.

The result of the conferences was that under date of January 10, 1951, RFC recommended an RFC loan of \$50,000,000 conditioned upon the borrower obtaining \$23,000,000 under the Defense Production Act, injecting \$5,000,000 equity capital, and obtaining from other sources a commitment for \$4,000,000 working capital.

This recommendation was followed and the loan certificate was signed by W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of NSRB, at that time the certifying authority, on January 12, 1951.

Mr. Chairman, so you have an inside glimpse of how the executive branch of our Government operates when not properly manned and directed by men of high moral character as well as properly checked by your congressional committees.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for a point of order.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. HILL. I am proceeding in order, absolutely in order, for I am talking about taxes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. There is nothing in this bill pertaining to taxes.

Mr. HILL. How are you going to get money to appropriate if it is not raised by taxes?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman admits he is out of order. This is an appropriation bill, not a tax bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HILL. May I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled. The paragraph under discussion is the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia.

Mr. HILL. I call the Chair's attention to lines 3 and 4 on page 2 of the bill. How do you get money into the Treasury if it is not through taxation?

The CHAIRMAN. This is an appropriation bill, not a tax bill; we are appropriating money now.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman tell me how you get money in the Treasury without obtaining it through taxes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not desire to enter into an argument with the gentleman. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HILL. I did not yield a while ago, why should I yield now?

Mr. KEATING. I want to help the gentleman, if I may.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. HILL. All we are hearing is from the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire what the word was

to which the gentleman's motion was directed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado was recognized on the pro forma amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I understand the gentleman moved to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. My inquiry is, What was the word which the gentleman moved to strike out?

The CHAIRMAN. The last words in that paragraph "sums as follows," which has to do with appropriations for the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEATING. "Sums as follows" may be the matter to which he was addressing himself.

The CHAIRMAN. "Sums as follows" are not taxes. The Chair has ruled that he is not proceeding in order, and he must proceed in order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. I expect to stay my 5 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have brought out here previously that Boston, Mass., on real estate, levies about \$9,000,000. Boston, Mass., has the same population as the District of Columbia. San Francisco, a city which has 30,000 less population than the District of Columbia, levies one and one-half times as much as the District of Columbia, or \$50,000,000. Now I want to ask the gentleman, Does he think it is fair that his city of Denver, Colo., should make tremendous levies on real estate for the purpose of helping the people here in the District of Columbia and let them get out from under the just taxes that they should pay?

Mr. HILL. Of course we should not, and one thing I have been listening for has been missing entirely, and that is with reference to land or buildings in the District of Columbia. If a building sells for \$30,000, certainly it ought not to be on the tax rolls at \$10,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is a gentleman, evidently, on the majority side, who feels that the gentleman offering this amendment has no interest in paying taxes in the District of Columbia. That gentleman is entirely incorrect.

Mr. HILL. You pay for all the food you get at the grocery store.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It also happens that I own a temporary place of abode here, so I do pay real-estate taxes and also personal-property taxes, and I personally am interested in what is happening in the District of Columbia. But, I want to be fair with the other States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think in all fairness it should be pointed out if you compare the taxes in Boston with those in the District of Columbia, about one-third of the property here is exempt from taxes, property which is owned by the Federal Government and by foreign embassies, for instance, which are

exempt from tax by laws made by this Congress.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Nebraska brings up a good point, but it is a point that should not be met by subterfuge which the opponents of the of the measure seek. It should be met straight on. The gentleman from California tells me, having just returned from Canada, that the Canadian Government is permitted to tax property such as we are talking about today, as I understand it. Certainly if that is the proper way to tax, then that is the way the money ought to be raised and not by way of a gift subject to the whims of a committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota to reduce the appropriation to the District of Columbia in the sum of \$1,200,000.

Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion with respect to the fact that a great amount of the property in the District of Columbia is owned by the Government. If the United States Capitol were not here in the District, then you would have very little property upon which to levy taxes. The question involved is one of fairness. I do not want to tax any one group of people more than the other. The question is whether the people who own property in the District of Columbia are paying their fair share of taxes as compared to the people of the great States of Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, and other States.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Kansas is speaking in order or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman himself should know that.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Well, I do not think he is, so I make the point of order against his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas will proceed in order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, I think I have been speaking in order, and I think if the gentleman from Indiana will give his attention to what I have to say, he will realize I am doing that very thing. I never heard of such objection before. I try to appreciate the very ardent interest of the gentleman from Indiana in this legislation. Surely we are in order when we discuss the merits or demerits of this bill, and we are in order when we talk about the great State of Indiana with respect to payment of taxes as compared with the District of Columbia. If he will look at the State of Indiana schedule of taxes compared with this District he might not hang his head in shame by supporting this amendment as was suggested a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Illinois.

I do not want the people in this District to pay any greater share of taxes

than anybody else. The lowest tax rate, comparatively speaking, is right here in the District of Columbia. What are the comparative tax rates? The tax rate in Baltimore is \$30 per thousand, it is \$32.70 in Cleveland, Ohio, \$27.40 in St. Louis, and it is \$21.50 in the District of Columbia. In San Francisco the rate goes up to \$62.

They will tell you that in some places they do not assess property at its full valuation. The fact of the matter is that they do not always do it in the District of Columbia. They use figures that reflect the value of the past but not the immediate values. In Chicago they may not assess on the full value, although they are expected to do so. But the total combined tax rate is much higher.

The tax in the District of Columbia is lower compared with the total taxes you pay in your State, your city, your county, your township, and your school district combined. Put those together, and point out any place in the United States where the people are more favored in the payment of taxes than they are in the District of Columbia.

What I am asking you to do is let the people in Washington pay their fair share of the taxes and no more. Nowhere in the United States where they have a State income tax is it lower than it is in the District of Columbia. We have only a very small sales tax, with a lot of exemptions. Go over in the State of Maryland and compare the taxes. The city of Baltimore is a good example where the property valued for tax purposes is approximately the same as the District of Columbia, but the taxes collected in the District of Columbia are \$10,000,000 less than they are in the city of Baltimore. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. We have an entirely different situation there. In the District you have no industry to tax at all.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct, but it does not alter the fact that tax rates are lower than in the District.

Mr. SASSCER. In the other cities you have industries to tax.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am talking about the tax rate. The amount of tax you pay on the amount of property you own. I want to add that right here in the District of Columbia we have the highest income per capita in the whole United States.

I do not criticize Members of the Committee on the District of Columbia. They have a tough job.

Let us just permit the people here in the District to pay their fair share of taxes. Then give consideration to the contribution from the Federal Treasury. That is all there is to it. Of course, this is a fine city. It ought to be a fine city. No one questions that. Whose is it? It belongs to the people of the United States. Of course it does. The people of the city and the country are proud of it. Let them pay their fair share of taxes. If you want them to do that, you will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

This amendment is more than fair. The amount is comparatively small, but is more than a million dollars. Here is an opportunity to reduce the deficit to some degree and relieve the taxpayers of this country of a burden that does not belong to them. The amendment should be approved.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the only thing before the House today is whether or not this appropriation for the District of Columbia should be cut.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman certainly will recall that this amendment will only place the appropriation for the District of Columbia, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, in the same amount actually as it was in 1951. The cut was based upon the appropriation in 1951.

Mr. SASSCER. I understood the gentleman to state that in his previous remarks. I think if we go back a year that is correct. I think it is equally correct that the appropriation by this amendment will be cut approximately \$1,000,000 below the amount the Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia felt necessary, after a very careful study.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I note from the table on page 23 of the hearings that Baltimore, Md., has a realty assessed valuation of \$1,516,000,000 and a tax rate of \$30.04, and the taxes assessed amount to \$45,000,000. In the District of Columbia the realty assessed valuation is \$1,667,000,000 and you pay only \$35,000,000 in taxes, \$10,000,000 less than you are taxing similarly valued property in Baltimore.

Mr. SASSCER. I will attempt to answer the gentleman on that from two angles. The city of Baltimore even with that tax rate receives substantial aid from the State of Maryland. The best example is this vast area known as Greater Washington. That includes not only the District of Columbia, but the area right over the line, where the only difference might be the numbering of the houses on the block. Up until last November in adjacent Prince Georges County the tax rate was approximately \$1.90, a figure lower than that in the District of Columbia. The situation there is comparable because neither section has any great industries to tax. Both areas have Government properties within their boundaries. To answer the observation made either by the learned gentleman from Kansas, or by a previous speaker, to the effect that the people in the District, regardless of this Government-owned property, should pay the taxes and that if the Capital were not here there would be no District of Columbia, I want to say that is the very reason and the very basic reason for this contribution, because as the Capital has spread out it has pushed more and

more people out of the District of Columbia into the environs of the great States of Maryland and Virginia, and there is a lessening of the assessable tax base of the District of Columbia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I still cannot understand why, you have an assessed valuation of \$1,600,000 in Baltimore and \$45,000,000 in taxes are paid in that city and you have slightly less than \$1,500,000 of assessed valuation in the District of Columbia, with \$10,000,000 less in taxes being paid—and that is on realty alone.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman from Kansas will look at the tax schedules he will find that the average tax paid per capita, meaning the average tax paid by each individual in Baltimore and Washington, you will find that in Baltimore each individual paid an average of \$48 and in Washington each individual paid \$44, so that the actual tax per person is almost the same. I think the gentleman misses the point there.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am talking about the real estate tax alone.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In most cities with an established population the comparison which the gentleman from Illinois makes would be good, but in a city which has a high degree of transient population, it is not so good because then we must depend upon such taxes as the sales tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the spirit in which this amendment is offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. I rise in opposition to his amendment. I think he and I have fought this battle of economy together throughout this session of the Congress and I doubt if he has voted for any amendment that I have not voted for. But there is a difference between legitimate economy and cutting down on the things that you can cut down. There is a difference between that and paying your just and honest obligations. That is what this is here today. That is what this is all about. It so happens that for a number of years I have been chairman of the Legislative Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has to do with the drafting and steering of some of these bills through the House. In 1947—and I doubt if the membership realizes this—the Congress passed a general tax law

covering franchise tax, income tax, and various and sundry other taxes. The Congress passed a revision of the tax laws. I suspect that practically every Member of the House here today who was here then voted for that bill. When you did that you undertook to put the District of Columbia on a sound fiscal basis by revising its tax laws, and you inserted a provision in the law that the District of Columbia should receive a Federal contribution of \$12,000,000. All that this Committee on Appropriations is doing is carrying out the mandate that you gentlemen sitting here today gave to this committee; namely, that the Federal Government should pay the District of Columbia \$12,000,000 as a result of a law which you passed just 3 years ago. Now, are you going to back out on it? That is all that is happening, it seems to me. I suspect that a good many Members do not realize that we have passed a law which fixes the contribution at \$12,000,000. It is said that last year it was only \$10,000,000. The only reason it was \$10,000,000 is because the House repudiated its contract to pay \$12,000,000. That was the only reason for it. Do you want to repudiate it again? That is all there is to this argument.

Now, there has been a great deal said about the real estate rate of taxation in the District of Columbia being lower than anywhere else in the country. We went all over that. We had many hearings when we revised the tax laws of the District of Columbia. That question was raised. It has always been raised. I was interested in it myself. So our committee had a survey made. We sent agents out to determine the question whether the actual dollar tax paid by the people in the District of Columbia compared favorably with that in Maryland and Virginia. Those agents who went out would select a house, say a five-room bungalow, erected by a contractor in the District of Columbia. Then they went over into Maryland and they found the identical house, built by the identical contractor. They went over into Virginia, and they did the same thing there. Then they saw what the tax assessments were on those houses, and how much, in dollars, the house owner paid.

We found by that report that the rate of taxation paid in the District of Columbia compared favorably with that in the surrounding neighborhood and territory.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. That survey disclosed that the District of Columbia, on that identical same house, built by the same identical person, paid \$194.28; Montgomery County, \$175.91; and Arlington County, \$168. The District paid more than any of them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now that shows the misapprehension that can come about by reason of talking about the tax rate. It does not make any difference about the rate. The assessment is what counts, and what eventually counts is how many dollars you have to pay in taxes on your home. The man in the District of Columbia pays more

dollars in taxes on his home than does the man in Maryland or Virginia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry, I do not have time. I am trying to explain to the House things that I personally, as a member of a legislative committee, just happen to know. I just know that there is a misapprehension about this thing. All we are arguing about today is to pay what you agreed to pay when you passed the tax bill 3 years ago. Pay your honest debts. That is all we ask you to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the thing that really counts on this amendment to reduce the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia is what is the fair and the right thing to do. I think we ought to consider a great many things in that connection. Amongst them is this: The District of Columbia was presented with the water plant by the Federal Government. It does show on the statement that they have furnished that they have an estimated deficit for 1952 of \$74,000. If they are short, it is because they are not charging sufficient rates to their people.

The District Commissioners are required to levy a tax rate, under the law, on real estate for whatever amount is not provided by other sources of income and the District surplus, so that there is no question of doing without any needed District activity.

There are the grandest parks in the United States available to the people of the District of Columbia, scot free, paid for by the Federal Government at an annual cost of millions of dollars. The Federal Government not only paid for the parks in the first place, whereas your folks and my folks back home have to pay for their own, but the expense of operating them is paid by the Federal Government.

There are a great many other things. In my home town, including State and Federal property, there is more property, in proportion, tax free, than there is here in Washington. Our tax rate is about \$38 or \$39 per thousand. Our assessments are something like 95 percent. Here in Washington the assessments average 65 percent, so they say. They try to make them that much; but when the Federal Government goes to condemn property, they find they come nearer being 50 percent, or even 40 percent.

Taking all this into consideration, is it the fair or honest thing for us to pay a contribution on the part of the Federal Government? Are we doing our duty to the people of the United States if we pay a contribution on the part of the United States for the operations of the District of Columbia? We provide them with an enormous payroll, 250,000 people, at an average of \$4,200 a year.

There are factories galore. I took a ride around the town Sunday. The automobile repair factories are the most enormous I have ever seen in any city of its size in the world; they are big, and they have a big business.

We have the Government Printing Office here with thousands of employees at big pay.

There is no reason for a Federal contribution at all. We should adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We have just heard previously the gentleman from New York speak; we have just heard from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who maintains—and by the way, I have a very high respect for the gentleman from Virginia—he maintains, however, that simply because the Congress in some past year authorized a certain limitation on expenditures along certain lines that we on the Committee on Appropriations must necessarily follow that dictate of the previous Congress.

Mr. TABER. It is the duty of this Congress to pass on what is the right thing to do. An authorization act is not a command, it is simply the authority to consider how much should be provided.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BATES of Kentucky and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Capital outlay: For construction of a branch library building in Cleveland Park, including site preparation, and preliminary design studies and surveys for the construction of extensions to the central library building, \$343,500.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

General administration, Health Department: For expenses necessary for the Health Department (excluding hospitals), including services for tuberculosis, venereal disease, hygiene and sanitation work in schools, dental health, maternal and child health, house-keeping assistance in cases of authentic indigent sick, handicapped and crippled children, cancer control, public health engineering, nursing, psychiatry, ambulances, laboratories, and out-patient relief of the poor, including medical and surgical supplies, artificial limbs and appliances, eyeglasses, and fees to physicians under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health and approved by the Commissioners; such expenses to include contract investigational service; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); uniforms; rent; manufacture of serum in indigent cases; and allowances for privately

owned automobiles used for the performance of official duties by dairy-farm inspectors at the rate of 7 cents per mile but not more than \$70 a month for each automobile; \$2,661,500: *Provided*, That, hereafter, the Commissioners may, without creating any obligation for the payment of money on account thereof, accept such volunteer services as they may deem expedient in connection with the maintenance of medical services in the Health Department: *Provided further*, That amounts to be determined by the Commissioners may be expended for special services in detecting adulteration of drugs and foods, including candy and milk and other products and services subject to inspection by the Health Department.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Page 17, line 12, after the period, insert "*Provided further*, That the Board of Commissioners shall provide for treating the water supply of the District of Columbia with a fluoride or chemical compound to the extent that it will provide dental protection for the people of the District of Columbia."

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the amendment read by the Clerk is one dealing with the fluoridation of water, and I realize that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, but I think my colleagues should know that fluorine treatment is now extensively used in the treatment of teeth in school children. I refer you to the testimony of Dr. Seckinger on page 291 of the hearings, where the question was asked, "What happened to the fluorine appropriation that was so controversial?"

Dr. SECKINGER. We have had this thing under study for several years. We are talking of topical fluorine first. That is application to the teeth. The District is contributing about \$30,000 to that already, and we get supervision and other assistance from the Public Health Service. The total runs up to about \$49,000 for half the school children in the District below the eighth grade. If you multiply that \$49,000 by 2, you get nearly \$100,000, which is the estimate of the waterworks people that we should spend in the application of hydrofluoric acid, and that would also include installation of equipment, \$21,000.

In my opinion, fluoridation of water has reached a point that it ought to be adopted in the District of Columbia. We are now spending some \$49,000 treating the children below the eighth grade. For \$100,000 all the people in the District of Columbia, seven or eight hundred thousand of them, could have the benefit of fluorine in water. There is a meeting today and tomorrow in the District by the dentists of the territory in which they are pointing out the value of fluoridation in water. I have introduced today, because I knew that this would be legislation on an appropriation bill, a bill to do just what I am asking to do in this amendment. I hope the Committee on the District of Columbia will report the bill out, and then it might be adopted. In my opinion, it has gone

to the point where it is a great benefit to the people, and it ought to be done.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE. I will ask the gentleman from Nebraska if it is not a fact that fluoridation in water has ceased to be in the experimental stage and it has now been demonstrated as proper treatment and is being used and incorporated and installed in practically all of the cities of this country.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is being installed all over, and in the end it will save many hundreds of thousands of dollars for the parents who have trouble with their children's teeth.

Mr. SCHWABE. And the gentleman wants to bring Washington in line with the other cities?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am in wholehearted support with the gentleman, and I think the bill should be reported out unanimously, because it has the backing of the American Dentist Society and the American Medical Association, and as our colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] has said, it is no longer in the experimental stage. That is the first discovery ever made that will prevent caries in children's teeth. I think that is the least we could do for the children, especially of school age.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I was as much interested as the gentleman in the subject. I asked the question. Commissioner Donohue in response to my question pointed out that he was undertaking a very comprehensive survey of the question in view of the fact that editorials had appeared in certain newspapers touching on the question as to whether or not fluoridation of water might not have a deleterious effect on other parts of the body. At the time of the hearings he had not yet completed that survey. I spoke to him later about it, and he indicated that the result of his survey was that those objections had been overcome.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Scientific examinations have proceeded far enough now on the use of fluorine in water so that it is no longer an experimental thing. We know it is beneficial to children, particularly children who are bothered with caries in their teeth.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska concedes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Page 17, line 11, after "milk", insert a comma and the following: "except milk that meets the standards of the United States Public Health Service for grade A milk shall be accepted in the District of Columbia."

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do not like to object, but the gentleman spoke on the subject yesterday. He and I represent different views on this subject. Without having an opportunity to reply to his views on the subject, I am constrained to insist on the point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Columbia Hospital and Lying-in Asylum: For general repairs including labor and material, to be expended under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol, \$5,000.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to the appropriation for the Health Department; that has been cut some by the Appropriations Committee and that is probably correct. I also refer you to page 17, where there is an appropriation for the inspection of milk. It reads as follows: "and allowances for privately owned automobiles used for the performance of official duties by dairy farm inspectors at the rate of 7 cents per mile but not more than \$70 a month for each automobile."

I bring that out because here in the District of Columbia they have a milk ordinance which prohibits milk from coming in from Maryland or Virginia unless the utensils handling milk have gone through the process of steam sterilization.

It does seem to me that the people in the District of Columbia are entitled to the same privileges the people have in 34 States and 1,400 cities with 100,000,000 people in these areas they will accept milk of grade A qualification as prescribed by the United States Public Health Service code for milk. What has happened here in the District of Columbia is that you have an increase in the price of milk because of the monopoly which says you cannot bring milk into the District unless it has been treated by steam sterilization. I happen to live over the line in Maryland. I can drink milk in the processing of which chemicals have been used on the pans and milking utensils. But in the District of Columbia you have to have milk that has gone through the steam process. This sets up a little monopoly here.

As the gentleman from Virginia has said, we have had some differences of opinion. There have been some bills before our legislative committee about this. I hope at the proper time we can find a bill coming from the Committee on Agriculture involving interstate and foreign commerce, and I hope that we may able

to place in that bill an amendment such as was read here, which will permit milk which meets the standards of the United States Public Health Service code for grade A milk to be accepted for interstate commerce, accepted by the United States Public Health Service people, accepted by all of the railroads, and accepted by all of the public groups as being milk that would meet the qualifications here in the District of Columbia, and thus break the Virginia-Maryland milk monopoly that now has a stranglehold upon the consumers of milk within the District of Columbia.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4329) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 56, noes 41.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The teller vote on the amendment showed 73 in favor of the amendment. I presume some of those Members are absent now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESOLUTION AFFIRMING FRIENDSHIP OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES FOR ALL PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (S. Con.

Res. 11) affirming the friendship of the American people for all peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and without objection the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. CHATHAM, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Mr. VORYS, and Mrs. BOLTON.

There was no objection.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until tomorrow night to file a report on the civil functions appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MILLS assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to inquire of the majority leader as to the program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, there being no District bills on Monday, we will take up the bill originally scheduled for today, H. R. 1129, authorizing research facilities for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has obtained consent to file a report on the civil functions appropriation bill and that has been scheduled for Tuesday.

Beyond that the program for next week has not yet been determined but will be announced later. Of course, if there are any conference reports, they may be brought up at any time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What is the program for tomorrow?

Mr. PRIEST. There is no business scheduled for tomorrow.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I might say there are a number of Members, on this side of the aisle, at least, who live on the other side of the Mississippi River, who are rather insistent that work be scheduled for Fridays and Mondays.

I think I am going to object to not meeting tomorrow. We will have a roll call or two tomorrow and keep on working, if possible.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say in response to the gentleman: I appreciate how he may feel about the matter. There is no legislation ready for consideration tomorrow.

So far as the House of Representatives is concerned and the handling of legislation on the floor, there is no log jam, there is no backlog of legislation; we are right up with the Rules Committee and the standing committees of the House. I say that in explanation of the intention to adjourn over.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Some of us are very anxious to get our teeth into the State Department bill. I suppose it is not log jammed any place and will come right up in logical sequence. I will not object to going over the week end but I will say that there is quite a large group of men on this side of the aisle who after this week I am sure will object to going over. We want to get busy on the State Department bill and other bills and get our work through so that perhaps we can take a couple of months recess and maybe go back home and talk with the people.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the gentleman from Nebraska that, together with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], we will schedule legislation just as rapidly as possible and proceed with it just as rapidly as possible. I will give the gentleman that full assurance.

LOW-RENT HOUSING

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of everyone concerned that the cut-back to 5,000 low-rent housing starts for the next fiscal year will put a stop on July 1 to about \$375,000,000 worth of building in the States of New York and New Jersey alone.

This will affect, during the next year, about 10,000 families of veterans and others of low income in the State of New Jersey, and over 25,000 other veteran and low-income families in the State of New York.

I am informed by the New York field office of the Public Housing Administration that low-rent housing project about to go into construction in 38 communities in the two States will be forced to come to a complete halt despite all the plans that have been going forward during the past year.

This will waste a lot of money not only for the United States Government, but for local governments as well. The Federal Government will suffer an irrevocable loss in these two States alone of some \$6,000,000 granted to local housing authorities in preliminary loans toward the building of low-rent housing proj-

ects. Of this \$6,000,000, more than two and a half million dollars already had been spent by May 1. Many of the sites for these projects have been purchased; in other cases options have been taken. Contracts have been entered into with local architects for plans covering the nearly 35,000 low-rent dwelling units involved.

There are other losses to local communities who have entered into cooperation agreements with the housing authorities, some of whom have contracted for utilities and other community services to be installed up to the sites of the proposed projects. All of these local governments would get their money back many times over if the projects were built, for the housing authorities contract for payment in lieu of taxes which more than make up for any outlays toward community services for project tenants.

However, if these 35,000 homes are not built, and the work is halted July 1, local housing authorities will be saddled with useless vacant property that cannot pay its way and will be a burden on all other taxpayers in their communities, while the tenants who would have occupied these projects will continue to live in unsanitary, crowded, disease- and crime-ridden slums.

If we apply this \$6,000,000 loss in preliminary loans in the States of New York and New Jersey proportionately to the entire country, where some communities have plans for low-rent housing projects, there is apparent an immediate loss to the Federal Government of \$28,000,000, with possible claims by local authorities to the United States Government for more than \$60,000,000 which will be irrevocably lost.

Let us also consider the loss to the wage earners. Approximately one-third of all housing construction costs goes for wages of workers in the building and construction trades unions. In the States of New York and New Jersey this means a loss of wages to these workers alone of approximately \$125,000,000. This does not include the losses to architects, engineers, planners, designers, and the myriad occupations and professions in private industry engaged in the production of housing for the low-rent program.

I would like to tell you exactly where these disastrous consequences will be felt not only by nearly 35,000 families of veterans and other low-income groups in New York and New Jersey, who will be deprived of decent homes, but by others in better circumstances who have planned for years to clear the slums in their communities and make them better places to live in for everyone.

Projects with complete plans, for which housing authorities have signed final contracts with the Federal Government, and which are on the verge of construction, are located in these communities in New York State: Albany, Buffalo, New York City, Port Chester, Troy, Watertown, and Yonkers. In New Jersey similar projects on the verge of construction under final contracts with the Government and completed plans exist in Asbury Park, Atlantic City, Bloomfield, Garfield, Harrison, Irvington,

Lodi, Long Branch, Newark, Orange, Passaic, Paterson, Rahway, South Amboy, and Union City.

Most of these projects, for which the Government has already advanced funds, have purchased their sites. In New Jersey these sites have already been purchased in Asbury Park, Bloomfield, Garfield, Harrison, Lodi, Long Branch, Morristown, Newark, Orange, Passaic, Paterson, Princeton, Rahway, South Amboy, and Union City. Only Atlantic City and Irvington, with final contracts and completed plans, have not as yet purchased sites, but in both cases the local housing authorities have already spent significant portions of the nearly \$200,000 which the Federal Government advanced them in preliminary loans to prepare for actual building.

In New York State, final contracts have been signed by the Federal Government with the housing authorities of Albany, Buffalo, New York City, Port Chester, Tarrytown, Troy, Watertown, and Yonkers. Sites have already been purchased for low-rent housing projects in Albany, New York City, Port Chester, Tarrytown, and Watertown but all of the rest of the 13 localities have been spending money from their preliminary loans for their advanced planning, and most of these loans are already gone. If the program is brought to a complete halt, this money will be completely wasted.

A few of the localities in New York and New Jersey I haven't as yet mentioned, which have these preliminary loans, include in New York State Jamestown, Mechanicville, and Plattsburg; and in New Jersey Burlington, Camden, Clifton, Florence, Guttenberg, Hackensack, Harrison, South Amboy, Trenton, Union City, and West New York.

Reservations have been approved for many other communities in these two States whose urgent problems of housing, particularly for those of low- and moderate-income groups, are becoming increasingly stringent with the advent of the national-defense emergency.

It might seem superfluous to point out that all agencies of the Federal Government, since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, have adapted their services to give preferential and even exclusive priorities to communities denoted as defense areas. The reports of the Public Housing Administration show that the public-housing program adapted itself speedily to the emergency situation, and no projects have been approved since last July for any community which did not have a strong relationship to the defense-production program.

As in World War II, when defense production created insufferable housing conditions in many communities in such fashion as to hamper the fulfillment of production quotas in many instances, we are now embarking upon a program which will be similarly handicapped unless adequate provision is made for housing, particularly where it is most needed, for families in the low- and moderate-income groups. The record shows in the States of New York and New Jersey that there were some communities during the last war where war industry was able to get only 50 percent

of its required personnel to meet military contracts, mostly because of the shortage of adequate, decent, and safe housing for defense workers' families.

If the answer of critics of the low-rent housing program is that such housing can be provided by private enterprise, we need only refer to the reports of last year's survey by the Bureau of the Census. This census reveals that 39 percent of the families in the United States were still earning less than \$2,000 per year at last report. On \$2,000 a year, I ask you what kind of housing, for purchase or rent, is being provided today by private industry? The latest census reports show that 25 percent of the children in the United States are in families who though gainfully occupied earn less than \$2,000 per year. And half of the children in the United States are in families with earnings of less than \$3,000. Less than 10 percent of the children in the United States are in families with earnings of \$6,000 and over. A look at any real-estate page in the newspaper will reveal that it is for this income group alone that private industry has been building since the war.

RUSSIA'S VIOLATIONS OF ITS AGREEMENTS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the discussions and debates of the last few months concerning our foreign policy and international affairs generally have stimulated a good deal of thinking among the people of this country, and have also aroused considerable interest abroad. Various views have been expressed concerning our foreign policy aims and our approach to the solution of international problems.

In connection with this very enlightening exchange of views and opinions, it seems to me that one particular phase which is of great importance to world affairs and world peace has not been brought into this over-all picture. I refer to the Soviet Union's failure and deliberate refusal to carry out its international commitments and agreements with the United States. It occurred to me that if we had a very definite bill of particulars showing how Russia violated these agreements, the people of this country and of the entire free world would have a clearer understanding of the problems with which we are confronted and the type of men with whom we have to deal.

Consequently, I decided to look into the record of Russia's international violations. I began to examine the major agreements entered into by our own country and the Soviet Union, beginning approximately from a period subsequent to our entry into World War II. I was interested in the terms of the agreements, the purposes and objects subscribed to by the powers in question, the facts ascertaining the time and procedure used by Russia in gaining control over Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia

and the other Eastern European countries, and how the Soviet Union violated and destroyed the freedom and independence of these countries while presumably and outwardly cooperating with the United Nations in international affairs.

I had recalled reading the agreement reached at the Tehran Conference in 1943, where it was stated as follows:

Emerging from these cordial conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny, and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

Let us now see how Russia violated this commitment.

The foreign relations of the United States have long been conducted on the basis of amity and friendship. That was and still remains the basis of our dealing with other countries. In post-war years we hoped to extend our policy of friendship to all nations, and we expected that it would work to the mutual advantage of all concerned. Our diplomacy has received its severest setback in our dealings with the Soviet Union, and this because of the Soviet Union's deliberate refusal to carry out its agreements. The selected instances I shall now cite will clearly show how the Government of the Soviet Union has broken its own promises and has violated solemnly signed international agreements.

THE UNITED STATES LEND-LEASE TO THE SOVIET UNION

In June 1941 Nazi forces attacked Russia. In the sincere hope of weakening and defeating Germany, we wanted to aid the Soviet Union. In August of that year we "decided to give all economic assistance practicable for the purpose of strengthening the Soviet Union in its struggle against armed aggression"—United States Department of State Bulletin, August 9, 1941, page 109. The Soviet Union appeared to be appreciative of such aid, and expressed "its gratitude for the friendly decision of the Government of the United States"—United States Department of State Bulletin, August 9, 1941, page 110. In the lend-lease agreement with the Soviet Union, signed on June 11, 1942, the Soviet Union agreed to return all war material not used in World War II, and also make some arrangements for repayment. Specifically, article V of this agreement provided that—

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency . . . such defense articles transferred under this agreement as shall not have been destroyed, lost, or consumed and as shall be determined by the President to be useful in the defense of the United States of America or of the Western Hemisphere or to be otherwise of use to the United States of America.¹

The language of this article is abundantly clear; it was made clear to the Russians when they signed the agreement.

¹ Stettinius, E. R., Lend-lease: weapon for victory, p. 342.

Since the end of the war the governments of all other countries which received lend-lease aid from us have made some settlement, have come to some agreement with us, but not Russia. The government of that country has simply refused to agree on any form of settlement on lend-lease aid totaling more than \$11,000,000,000 in value.

During the past 5 years many conferences have been held for this purpose, but none has produced any result. The Soviet Union simply refuses to settle its accounts with us. In the course of negotiations that have been going on recently her representative declared that United States vessels given to the Soviet Union on lend-lease will not be returned because "the United States does not need the vessels"—Washington Post, March 22, 1951, page 1. The Soviet representative even refused to consider the return of 670 vessels, and he accused the United States "of violating a promise to sell the ships to the Soviet Union." Of course all this is senseless talk. The master lend-lease agreement, signed on June 11, 1942, contains no such promise. But all that is beside the point. Here we have a case case of violation of our agreement by the Soviet Government.

THE TEHRAN DECLARATION

At the end of the Tehran Conference in November-December 1943, the heads of the three governments guaranteed, in a declaration, "the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and the territorial integrity of Iran"—United States Department of State Bulletin, December 11, 1943, page 410. Stalin had also agreed, in the Treaty of Alliance which the Soviet Union signed on January 12, 1942, with Iran, to withdraw all Soviet forces "from Iranian territory not later than 6 months after all hostilities between the Allied Powers and Germany and her associates have been suspended by the conclusion of an armistice or armistices"—Lenczowski, G., Russia and the West in Iran, 1918-48, page 321.

Six months after the end of World War II all other foreign troops had withdrawn from Iran, but Russian troops were still in the northwestern province of Iran. Instead of withdrawing, they were there to set up a Communist puppet government to oppose the national Government in Tehran. This was in clear violation of the agreement signed with Iran, and also in contradiction to the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin declaration on the independence and territorial integrity of Iran. Of course, Iran protested and requested the withdrawal of Soviet troops. The Soviet Government refused to withdraw. Under the protection of the Soviet authorities a puppet Communist government was set up in Iran's northwestern province. When the Central Government tried to dispatch forces to the province in order to reestablish its authority, the Soviet forces intervened. For a time the province was declared a separate unit, independent of the Tehran Government. Iran appealed to the United Nations and the matter was taken up by the Security Council. There the free world stood for

the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran, finally compelling the Soviet Union to withdraw.

THE YALTA AGREEMENT

In February 1945 the late President Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin held a conference in the Crimea, and on February 11 signed the Yalta agreement. The part of this agreement which was flagrantly violated by the Soviet Union dealt with the new situations created in the liberated countries of Eastern Europe—specifically in Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary.

The Yalta agreement stipulated that the Polish provisional government—set up under the control of Moscow—be “re-organized on a broader basis, with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad”—United States Department of State press release No. 239, March 24, 1947, page 5. This meant the participation in the Polish provisional government of some members from the Polish Government-in-exile and also some underground leaders in Poland. Our Ambassador and the British Ambassador in Moscow, with Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, were to form a commission, with authority to act as mediators in the creation of such a government in Poland. This was done; the basis of the new Government was broadened, but when the new Government was formed in June 1945 Communist membership outnumbered others 4 to 1—Rose, W. J., *Poland: Old and New*, page 277. From then on Poland had been lost to the west.

By deliberately blocking the formation of a democratic government in Poland the Soviet Union violated the Yalta Agreement.

Russia also failed to carry out the provisions of the Yalta Agreement dealing with Rumania and Yugoslavia. In the case of Rumania, the Soviet Union acted quickly and unilaterally in establishing a prefabricated Communist government in March 1945—Byrnes, J. F., *Speaking Frankly*, pages 54–55. In Yugoslavia, Tito's government was to be broadened to include members of the Yugoslav Government-in-exile. The Communists—then loyal tools of Moscow—again went through the move of reorganizing the government and included in the new government, as constituted in March 1945, some non-Communists, but they occupied unimportant posts. Before the end of 1945 Yugoslavia came under communism. The Soviet Union did not try to establish a democratic government. Instead, the U. S. S. R. saw to it that the government which was approved and supported served Soviet interests.

In the case of Bulgaria, the Soviet Union acted as in Rumania. The combination of Communists and pro-Communists set up a government under Soviet patronage in mid-1945. We protested about the make-up of the government, and in the Moscow conference of foreign ministers, in December 1945, it was decided to broaden the base of the government so as to include some non-Communists. This was never done. A new reshuffle of the government accentuated

the dominance of the Communists. All this occurred while we were negotiating with the Soviet Union for peace treaties with the satellites. The peace treaties were signed in February 1947, but Bulgaria, along with Rumania, Poland, and Albania, was drawn behind the iron curtain.

Albania fell under the ruthless clique of Communist Enver Hoxha early in 1945. We have not recognized the Government of Albania.

Czechoslovakia signed a treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and postwar collaboration with the Soviet Union on December 12, 1943. The first postwar government established in May 1945 was headed by a diplomat with pronounced Soviet leanings, Zdenek Fierlinger. In appearance this was a coalition government in which Communists held only four cabinet posts. But these included the important posts of the ministry of the interior and of information. While the government did not dare to make a single move which would have caused resentment in Moscow, Czech Communists in the government worked hard to undermine the government, and in this work of trickery they had the tacit and unqualified support of the Soviet Union. Until 1947 the power of the Communists increased gradually. After gaining the prime ministership, and especially the control of the army through a friendly Minister of National Defense, the stage was set for taking over the administration. The Czechs could not make a single move without Soviet approval. In July 1947, they expressed the wish to join the Marshall plan countries. They were held back with an iron hand by Russia. In February of the following year the government was overthrown; a new cabinet of Communists and left-wing Socialists was installed. This proved to be the death of free Czechoslovakia. It was brought about with the aid and encouragement of the Soviet Union and in clear violation of the Teheran declaration.

In October 1944 Hungary was liberated and a provisional government was formed. This Government was sponsored by the Soviet Union. In November of the following year an election was held in which the non-Communist group—called Smallholders Party—gained a clear victory. The country was declared a republic and a new coalition government was formed in which other parties were represented, but, with the support of the Soviet commander in Hungary, important and strategic posts went to Communists. They secured thereby the foothold which enabled them to begin their rise to power. Finally in May 1947 Prime Minister Nagy was forced out and his place was taken by a left-wing member of the Smallholders Party. In August of that year another election was held which gave a victory to the Communists. Since then Hungary has been governed by the Communists. Against all these tactics and violations of the Soviet Government we protested, but to no avail.

THE POTSDAM AGREEMENT

This agreement was signed by President Truman, Prime Minister Attlee, and Premier Stalin. It dealt with a

large number of important problems, but the particular items which concern us here are the treatment of Germany as an economic unit, and the problem of reparations.

Part B, paragraph 14, of the Potsdam Agreement stipulated that “during the period of occupation Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit”—United States Department of State press release No. 238, March 24, 1947, page 5. This meant the unrestricted flow of agricultural products from the Soviet zone to the West and the equally unrestricted flow of industrial products from Western Germany to the Soviet occupation zone. To maintain a balanced economy in Germany this was essential, but the authorities of the Soviet Union never carried out their end of the bargain. During the first several years industrial goods did go to the Soviet occupation zone, and the Soviet Union took advantage of the West's good will, exploiting it to the full until mid-1948. The western powers were conscientious in keeping their end of the bargain, but not the U. S. S. R. While Berlin was blockaded and we were almost forced out of that city, the Soviet Union was receiving its share of dismantled German industrial plants as reparations. It may be that by such action we meant to set a good example for the Soviet Government; if so, it had little effect on the rulers in the Kremlin. They received industrial goods, dismantled industrial plants, and also carried out a systematic and drastic looting of the eastern zone.

The Soviet Government persistently refused to carry out the Potsdam commitment signed by Premier Stalin—

Commented Gen. Walter Bedell Smith:

It demanded as the price of keeping its promise rich additional concessions, including fulfillment from current production of its demand for over-all reparations totaling \$10,000,000,000.²

FOUR-POWER AGREEMENT ON BERLIN

Russia's blunt and undisguised attempt to freeze and eventually expel us from Berlin is a celebrated instance of treaty violation. By the terms of the four-power agreement—United States Department of State Bulletin, June 10, 1945, page 1052—the area of greater Berlin was to be divided into four sectors and the four commandants were “to direct jointly its administration.” This arrangement never worked out smoothly. The city being deep in the Soviet zone, Soviet authorities were in a position to—and did—introduce restrictions affecting the entry and exit of the Western Powers. This was in clear violation of a four-power agreement. “The right of free access to the city was carefully specified in a message sent by President Truman to Premier Stalin on June 14, 1945.” Two days later Premier Stalin assured the President that “all necessary measures would be taken in accordance with the plan agreed upon.”—Smith; in the work cited, page 234. On June 24, 1948, the Soviet Government imposed a complete blockade on all land and water

² Smith, W. B., *My 3 Years in Moscow*, p. 230.

traffic from the western zones into Berlin. This created an international issue of first magnitude. For almost a year all negotiations proved fruitless, and we stayed in Berlin only with the help of the airlift. It proved to be a moral victory for us, but still remains a flagrant violation of agreement on the part of the Soviet Union.

Another case of flagrant violation of an agreement by the Soviet Union relates to the repatriation of German prisoners of war. At the Moscow meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, in April 1947, it was agreed that—

German prisoners of war located in the territory of the Allied Powers and in all other territories will be returned to Germany by December 31, 1948.³

We have carried out our part of the agreement; and we have so informed the International Red Cross, but the Soviet Union failed to repatriate the German prisoners. We have made repeated protests, so have the British, but no satisfactory reply has been received, and none is expected.

Mr. Speaker, in their postwar dealings with the West, and particularly with the United States, Soviet authorities have used all the tricks of gangster politicians, the tactics of the strong-arm. Name-calling, unfounded and baseless accusations, warlike threats, all unworthy means have been their stock in trade. They speak in the name of peace-loving democracies, yet they have and maintain the largest armed forces. They call us imperialists and warmongers, yet they acquire large tracts of territories both in Europe and Asia, and they foment wars and uprisings, such as the Korean conflict and the unrest in Greece. They are not the least concerned with keeping their promises, commitments, and agreements.

The long succession of postwar violations of treaties and agreements by the Soviet Union makes it clear that they take the coldly realistic, Machiavellian attitude in diplomacy: agreements are made and maintained for the sheer convenience of one party, and the moment it becomes inconvenient to honor them, or to fulfill them, then they are bypassed, discarded, and violated.

In view of Russia's consistent and deliberate violation of her international commitments during the past decade, I submit that her record of international amity and cooperation is one of total and complete failure, and I further charge her with sabotaging every sincere effort toward genuine world peace and international understanding. In the case of an individual, such actions would be considered as the height of irresponsibility; in the case of a major world power, this Machiavellian attitude and the utter disregard of world opinion on the part of Russia constitute a threat and a danger to all of humanity.

Mr. Speaker, the sooner the people of this country learn these facts, the sooner we can hope to attain national unity of purpose and national cooperation to safeguard our freedom. This is a time which calls for every man, woman, and

child to know the truth. In this way we can strengthen the hand of our Government in its efforts to defend this country and our way of life.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] is recognized for 25 minutes.

WITHHOLDING TAX SHOULD BE REPEALED

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, instead of enacting new withholding tax clauses, as set up in 1951 tax proposals, Congress should eliminate the withholding tax provision now on the books.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a bill providing for the repeal of income tax withholding levies on wages and salaries.

This method of tax collection was included in the pay-as-you-go tax law passed in 1943.

Then, proponents declared that the war shift and turn-over of labor required this method to minimize tax delinquency and reduce collection costs. These contentions seemed very plausible.

And so despite extensive discussions of the Ruml tax plan and amendments thereto, the withholding proviso was adopted without serious debate. Its vital defects were overlooked. We did not reckon with its moral and political consequences.

Even now, there is little attention given to these factors. Instead, Congress will soon consider new taxes in the vain hope of catching up with unlimited global spending schemes.

WITHHOLDING TAX IS MORALLY WRONG

Mr. Speaker, the withholding tax on wages and salaries is morally wrong. It is morally wrong because it seizes from the worker a substantial part of "the fruits of his labors" even before he comes into possession of the earnings from his toil.

The worker, in a land founded on freedom, is denied the basic right to receive and take home the wages earned by the sweat of his brow. History records many instances of harsh and cruel taxation, but generally, the worker has received his wages in full before the Government claimed part of them as taxes.

This tactic follows the pattern of the slave owner. He simply carries this idea to its logical conclusion and takes the full amount of what his slaves earn. Then, to his own judgment, he spends those earnings for what he decides is for the benefit of his slaves. The withholding tax is based on the same false concept.

IS HIGHLY DISCRIMINATORY

Also, the withholding tax is grossly unfair because it is shamefully discriminatory. It says to those who earn their living by wages and salaries, "Your Government does not trust you." It says the

Government accepts St. Paul's dictum that "The husbandman"—farmer—"that laboreth must be first partaker of the fruits" but this biblical truth does not apply to those employed by others. It sets up a double standard.

The withholding statute says in effect: "Your Government trusts the farmer, the professional man, the landlord, the merchant. But the Government does not trust those who work for others. We will grab our tax levy from them before they can collect a dime of wages or salary."

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TAX IS QUESTIONABLE

My third objection to the withholding tax is its almost obvious unconstitutionality. No compensation is paid by the Government to the employer for the work of figuring, collecting, and remitting this tax to the Government. He is deprived of his property without due process of law.

Here the administration apparently is so convinced of its own guilt that it has been unwilling to have the Supreme Court pass on the issue, despite the repeated challenges of a courageous patriot, Vivien Kellems of Connecticut.

Instead, the great Government of the United States maliciously harasses Miss Kellems. Why? Because she wants a full test of the constitutionality of this statute. Has it become verboten for political opponents of the New Deal to get a test of questionable legislation in the courts?

INSULTS INTELLIGENCE OF AMERICAN WORKER

Mr. Speaker, the withholding-tax device is a smear on both the character and competence of our working people. Under this law, the Government takes the position that either the workingman is so dishonest that he will not pay his legitimate taxes; or, the Government thinks that while the American employee may be honest, he does not have brains enough to save and set aside the amount he must pay in income taxes if it be collected from him on a quarterly basis, the same as other taxpayers.

There is nothing in the history of the working people of America to justify these governmental attitudes.

United States Department of Commerce studies record that the open credit obligations of American consumers are fulfilled 99.44 percent. The record of installment sales tells a similar story of the honesty of the American workingman.

Moreover, according to Treasury testimony, uncollectible Federal tax assessments increased only one-tenth of 1 percent between 1921 and 1942. This was a period during which millions of persons were added to the tax rolls and there was no withholding tax.

WITHHOLDING TAX CAUSES COMPLICATIONS

Another glib argument used to defend the withholding tax needs study. It is the claim that this method is the simple, convenient, and inexpensive method to collect personal-income taxes. Here again, the claim seems wide of the truth.

The Treasury Department informs me that in the fiscal year 1951, it will issue approximately 30,000,000 income-tax refund checks in the operation of the with-

³ U. S. Department of State, Publication No. 3550, Germany, 1947-49, p. 121.

holding-tax scheme. Think that over—30,000,000 checks. To figure out those amounts, double-check them for accuracy, mail them out, the workers cash them, and account for them when they are returned to the Treasury, undoubtedly requires millions of man-hours.

So, withholding is not so simple and inexpensive as the Treasury might like you to believe. Even if it were, is there anything in this administration's record to indicate that they have any reluctance toward larger staffs?

My fourth objection to the withholding tax is of paramount importance. It stems from the fact that such a tax is unsound in a republic whose strength depends almost entirely on a well-informed electorate.

NAZIS LIKED WITHHOLDING TAX METHOD

Certainly, this scheme is understandable in a totalitarian country. The Nazis were experts in using this method of taxation. They called their various compulsory levies at the source "noiseless financing." The term was well chosen. Withholding taxes are perfectly suited to a Fascist system, or other form of dictatorship.

Such taxes take from the citizen the full opportunity to measure the size and impact of Federal levies. By the insidious device of seizing a part of his wages many times a year, the withholding tax blurs the full picture of the fantastic magnitude of Federal spending.

Moreover, the withholding tax, as an adjunct to the steeply graduated income tax, fits into the pattern of communism. For it is the graduated income tax that is next to the top of the list of objectives set out in the original Communist Manifesto of 1848. Think that over.

COMMUNISTS ALSO STRONG FOR WITHHOLDING TAXES

Then listen to this, back in 1919, from the pen of N. Boukharin comes this about the program of the Communists:

Superfluous wealth is confiscated, the rich are losing their main support and the whole population is gradually becoming employed by the Proletarian state organization. * * * When such a state of things exists, it will be much simpler to deduct the necessary taxes immediately from salaries. * * * It is not worth while spending both time and money on the senseless transaction of giving with one hand and taking away with the other. (Lusk Report, vol. II, p. 1738.)

On this conclusion, the Treasury Department and Comrade Boukharin are in full agreement. Neither believes that the worker has a right to have even temporarily the full fruits of his labors. Interesting, is it not?

Mr. Speaker, it was William Pitt who declared:

No civilization * * * can be accepted as secure in which expenditure is greater than revenue.

Pitt was most certainly right.

And so today, western civilization is in peril, not alone from Russia, but also, from centralized power and unrestrained spending at home, spending which the people are currently unable to halt. This has become a progressively worse problem in America for the past 20 years.

REPEAL WOULD RESTORE POWER TO THE PEOPLE

The repeal of the withholding tax would be a long step toward halting this advance by socialism. Then, the millions of tax-burdened laborers now treated as second-class citizens and deceived by take-home pay would get a clear picture of their personal stake in Government spending.

Recognized again as honest and competent citizens, their constructive power in national elections would be multiplied.

Each worker would have a fair opportunity to measure the impact of Federal taxation.

He would know what the failures of bungling leadership are costing his own family in medical care, better housing, college educations, and so forth.

Fortified by that full knowledge, he could and would vote with well-informed judgment—a judgment not beclouded by noiseless taxation schemes copied from the Nazis and the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, withholding taxes on income are indefensible in a land of freedom. When such taxes are applied to only a special segment of the population, they are viciously discriminatory. Such tax methods undermine the freedom and vigilance upon which our Republic is based.

Once this injustice is clearly understood, only those who do not trust the American workingman will oppose the repeal of this totalitarian method of taxation. Congress should repeal the withholding tax on salaries and wages.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I compliment the gentleman on his fine statement on this matter. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me that the withholding-tax legislation has not tended to create a tax-consciousness on the part of the people whose taxes are being withheld.

Mr. BUFFETT. It is certainly obvious, as the gentleman suggests, that the device of withholding seals from the worker's mind, or at least blurs his vision to the fact that the money is being taken out of his pocket and out of his home in order that it can be spent by the Government as the Government pleases. By the device of collecting that money in small installments over the year it is true the impact is kept from him. The result is that he takes much less interest in Federal spending than he would otherwise take as a good citizen.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROHIBITION AGAINST COLLUSIVE PRICE FIXING

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill, the effect of which is to restore section 1 of the Sherman antitrust law to its original form, and to repeal the so-called Miller-Tydings Act, which was in fact no more than a rider to a District of Columbia

Revenue Act. This rider slipped through Congress and escaped veto by President Roosevelt, who was on record as strongly opposing its principles, only because it came up in the final hours of the session and being attached to an essential revenue measure, President Roosevelt declined to exercise his veto. As is well known, the act legalized, so far as the Federal antitrust laws were concerned, certain agreements by which the manufacturer is enabled to control the ultimate retail price at which products may be sold to the consumer, providing the State in which such sales are made has passed an authorizing act.

Active lobbying and pressure by the proponents upon the State legislatures resulted in passage by all but three States and the District of Columbia of such authorizing acts. Missouri, I am happy to say, is one of the three States in which the legislature has rejected fair trade and thereby has protected the people of that State from excessive prices, such as are charged in neighboring States as a result of the price-fixing agreements. The application of fair trade rapidly was extended to permit price maintenance throughout the entire State, if the manufacturer could induce a single retailer in that State to sign an agreement.

It was this feature which the Supreme Court recently condemned, holding that only those retailers who actually entered into a contract or agreement with the manufacturer were bound to observe the prices established. The proponents of fair trade insist that this ruling is not nearly so broad as the language of the Court would seem to indicate and are trying desperately to prevail upon retailers through persuasion or duress to continue to operate under the fixed prices previously set. A few retailers have taken the Court at its word and are abandoning price maintenance. At the present time we see a limited sort of price war existing among several larger New York department stores. Proponents of fair trade would like to have us believe that price wars and chaotic conditions are the natural result to be experienced if fair-trade laws are done away with. The answer to that is obvious. There would be no price war or price cutting, were it not for the fact that in many lines of consumer goods supplies exceed the existing demand at exorbitant fair-trade prices and, coupled with excessive inventories, the retailer is following a time-honored practice of reducing his prices to such point that he is able to move his goods.

I hardly need to point out the long history of opposition to restraint of trade, both in England and in the United States, and that such opposition was reflected in the common law of both countries. The Sherman Act of 1890 codified this common law and flatly forbid all contracts, combinations, and so forth, in restraint of trade and not only made such contracts unenforceable but provided injunctive relief and criminal penalties as well. In 1937, as I stated above, the Miller-Tydings Act became a law, and the Congress had reversed our traditional policy forbidding restraint

of trade and granted authority to a private manufacturer to enter into price-fixing agreements without supervision by any governmental agency.

The proponents of fair trade are sometimes heard to argue that this legislation is necessary and desirable because it protects the public from deception through a possible passing off of inferior substitutes for nationally known and advertised brand-name products. This argument seems exceptionally weak. First, the Congress has created the Federal Trade Commission to protect the public against deceptive practices and misrepresentation of the quality and content of products. Second, through the administration of the pure food and drug laws, further governmental protection exists for the buying public. Surely, then, there is no force to the argument that the public lacks proper protection and that they must look to the producer of goods operating under price-fixing schemes for their salvation.

The purpose of my bill is twofold. First, to eliminate any misunderstanding and confusion which may exist as a result of the recent Supreme Court ruling; and, second, to reestablish the prohibition against collusive price fixing which, for so many years, served the best interests of the Nation and the consuming public. It is my belief that the antitrust laws, including the prohibition against the restraint of trade, are an essential bulwark of our free enterprise and free market system. The effectiveness of these salutary laws should be increased rather than weakened, and if we are to pay more than lip service to the principle of a free economic system, it seems incumbent upon the Congress to protect that principle and to end once and for all this system of legalized price fixing.

I have inserted in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times on this subject, which I believe will be of interest.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to some new forces that are in this field of price fixing which were not there when the Sherman antitrust law was passed. I believe it was just last year when the Ford Motor Co. told us that in 1936 a Ford cost something around \$506 at the plant. But this year, or last year, there is \$511 collected by the Ford Motor Co. in taxes as a tax-collection agent for the Government. I also call attention to the fact that by bargaining across industry and countenancing that practice, our Government has aided labor officials in putting a wage differential of about \$400 in every workingman's car. When you have that you still have an eight or nine hundred dollar workingman's car, except that he pays \$1,800 or \$1,900 for it. Those forces are not going to be controlled by public demand. They are not going to tolerate being controlled because the Government needs a billion dollars in taxes collected from the workingman on those automobiles. Perhaps

that enters into the picture which the gentleman sees, and is seeking to correct. Under that situation which did not exist at the turn of the century when we had the Sherman antitrust law enacted, we now have the situation where one motor industry makes more profit than all of the railroads in the United States combined, and they are in a position to make marginal producers out of everyone else in the industry if they want to cut prices, which they are afraid to do when they are producing 45 percent or 50 percent of the automobiles already. I call the attention of the gentleman to that because what we are after is competition and lower prices. I think it will direct the gentleman's attention or perhaps arouse his curiosity as to what we have not had in the motor industry; namely, any new competition for 20 years except for that concern which periodically comes to the great city of Washington for financing in order to compete, and that concern is the one which helps in setting the pattern of bargaining across industries.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. It is perfectly true that a lot of things have changed since 1890. However, certain fundamental principles, in my opinion, have not changed, and among those principles are exactly what I am talking about, which is really free competition. The way the trade combines were developed under the Miller-Tydings Act is exactly what we are trying to eliminate. I think we see an example in some of these items in the recent price war in New York on these standard, nationally advertised brands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FURMAN UNIVERSITY CELEBRATES ITS ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of appreciation that I am privileged to salute Furman University of Greenville, S. C., on the occasion of its one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary. My appreciation stems principally from the fact that both my wife and I are alumni of this great school and owe much to it as a source of inspiration and knowledge. But I also have a feeling of pride in the contribution Furman is making to the cultural heritage of our Nation.

From its earliest days, Furman has been an alive and growing institution. It had its beginnings in the desire of South Carolina Baptist leaders to create an educational center for the training of Baptist ministerial students. The learned and devout head of this movement was Dr. Richard C. Furman, the great Baptist minister for whom the university is named. Under his guidance the first general organization of Baptists in the United States was established. As president of this organization he set forth his views on the necessity of an educated ministry. In 1821, he led in the organization of the South Carolina

Baptist State Convention, which had the advancement of education as one of its primary objectives. In spite of obstacles and opposition, the convention soon conceived a plan for the establishment of a theological institution. It was 1826, however, before Furman Academy and Theological Institution opened its doors to its first students. Dr. Furman died in 1825, without seeing the full realization of his dream, but the work he sought to achieve still lives today in Furman University.

The early days of Furman Academy were days of wandering. The institution opened at Edgefield, S. C. After a short period it was moved to the High Hills of the Santee and then to Winnsboro in Fairfield County. In 1844 the faculty of the school was augmented by the addition of Dr. James C. Furman as senior professor. Dr. James Furman brought with him to his post the wisdom and foresight gained from his illustrious father. Through his encouraging influence, interest grew in the idea that South Carolina Baptists should concern themselves with the higher education of young laymen as well as of ministers. In June 1850 the State Baptist Convention went on record as favoring this proposal. It directed that plans for the establishment of the new school should be carried out as soon as the sum of \$70,000 had been contributed for the purpose.

The enthusiastic response which greeted the new plan caused the trustees to authorize the sale of land and buildings at Winnsboro in December 1850. In February 1851 the school opened its doors in Greenville, the beautiful mountain town which had been selected as its new site.

From 1851 to 1951 the story of Furman University has been one of continuous growth and progress. According to the first catalog published in 1852, the University consisted of three departments in its beginning days. These were the academic, the collegiate, and the theological departments. During the first year of its existence the university had 68 students and 4 faculty members.

In 1951 student enrollment totals approximately 1,200, with a faculty of about 100 professors and instructors. Two hundred and forty-eight graduates were given degrees this year. Courses are offered leading to the degrees of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of arts in music and master of arts. For purposes of guidance and concentration, the departments of instruction are grouped into three general fields—the humanities, the social sciences, and mathematics and the natural sciences.

A recitation of these comparisons gives only a small indication, however, of the tremendous strides Furman has made to become one of the leading liberal arts colleges in the South. Through the years it has had the consistently inspired leadership of foremost educators such as Presidents James C. Furman, Charles Manly, Andrew P. Montague, Edwin M. Poteat, William J. McGlothlin, Fennette E. Geer, and John L. Plyler, four of whom I have known personally. Each of these gentlemen contributed be-

yond the ordinary to the development of Furman.

In addition to these distinguished presidents, we would not forget that many capable, devoted, and conscientious professors at whose feet we were privileged to sit.

Even before he became President, Dr. Bennette E. Geer aided Furman's financial cause through his friendship with the late James B. Duke. In 1924, Dr. Geer was made a trustee of the \$40,000,000 Duke Endowment Fund and was directly responsible for the grant to Furman of five percent of the annual income from this amount.

Another one of the milestones in Furman's history was accomplished during the administration of Dr. Geer. This event was the coordination of Furman with Greenville Woman's College. The Woman's College has a history of its own, dating back to 1819 and the establishment of a female academy on the present campus site.

The academy became the Greenville Baptist Female College in 1854 when the Baptists of the State obtained the school. From that time until 1908 a relationship with Furman University existed through the fact that the two schools were governed by the same board of trustees. This contact was broken in 1908, however, and was not resumed until 1933 when a mutual betterment of the two schools was accomplished by the combination of programs and facilities.

It is interesting to note that after 125 years the name of Furman is still intimately connected with the operation of the school. Alester G. Furman, Jr. of Greenville is the present chairman of the Board of Trustees and his father, Alester G. Furman, is an honorary member of the Board.

The present head of Furman University is Dr. John L. Plyler, an alumnus of the school and a native of South Carolina. He assumed office in 1939, after having served as dean of Furman Law School and as judge of the Greenville County Court. Under his administration the University has paid off an indebtedness of \$250,000 and has increased the value of its endowment, land, plant, and equipment from \$2,000,000 to more than \$5,000,000.

Under his leadership, also, the university is currently visualizing the greatest expansion in its long lifetime of service to the Nation. Recently, after a careful study of present facilities and future needs, the board of trustees concluded that limitations on the campus and buildings of Furman made their continued use impractical.

It was found that the growth of the city of Greenville had kept pace with the growth of Furman University. Greenville's business district now surrounds both the men's campus and the women's college grounds. Neither is large enough for expansion and the mile-length of Main Street which separates them prevents any consolidation.

The board of trustees recommended, therefore, that a new campus site be purchased and developed. Accordingly, in the fall of 1950, the university acquired some 900 acres of land at a spot about 5 miles from the business section

of Greenville. Here it hopes eventually to construct an educational center adequate to its needs.

Thus, Furman has grown from a small school with only a handful of students to a great institution, sending out into the world each year several hundred young men and women, destined to serve in all walks of life. Originally, Furman was designed to provide an educated Baptist ministry. It has, even to the present day, contributed richly to this field. Many of the leading Baptist ministers throughout the world, including the present president of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. R. G. Lee, are graduates of Furman. Leaders in the professional, religious, commercial, and educational world receive their basic education at Furman. In the education of young laymen, the university has defined its objectives as "to offer under distinctly Christian influences an opportunity for the realization of personal values and the achievement of social competence."

Its goal is to graduate students who have acquired:

First. A philosophy of life which will afford them stability through varied experiences.

Second. A poise which will enable them to meet personal situations with confidence and a social point of view which will give them a sense of community responsibility.

Third. An effective understanding of the ways in which they can contribute to their own physical well-being.

Fourth. A professional interest which will lead to economic independence.

Fifth. A growing knowledge and appreciation of art, literature, and sciences.

Distinctly Christian influences are too often neglected in the educational institutions of our Nation. If we study the history of the higher educational system in the United States, we discover that the majority of our early colleges were church-established and church-operated. As the years have progressed, the percentage of church-related colleges in the United States has steadily diminished. Partially as the result of the decrease of church influence, we have seen some serious moral lapses on the part of our young people.

It is encouraging, in view of these facts, to know that universities like Furman exist to teach the Christian philosophy of life to our young people. Although it is a Baptist school, Furman University encourages other denominational organizations on its campus. It has a Canterbury Club for Episcopal students, a Wesley Foundation Club for Methodist students, and a Westminster Fellowship for Presbyterian students. The university aids these groups by sponsoring annually a religious emphasis week during which Christian leaders speak in daily services. Furman University is known as the mother institution of our great Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Ky.

More important than the above organizations, however, is the constant atmosphere of a Christian life which Furman provides for its students. Through its Christian faculty and Christian ideals, Furman teaches a way of life which will

enable each of its young people to know how to live while earning his living. In this the university is performing a function which is essential to the continued freedom and greatness of the United States.

In a place such as this university, Christian principles are taught more effectively than in the larger universities. It is in a place such as this that the finer ideals of Christianity are being exemplified and students are being trained to let these principles guide them in all their actions. A place like this allows men and women to get a finer perception of what service can mean.

You have no doubt been told of the rewards of service. Rewards which mean not just the amassing of wealth, but the development of the whole human personality—a personality which is developed by the exercise of the hand, of the head, and of the heart.

The Fourth South Carolina Congressional District is the smallest one in area in our State, but one of the largest in population. We are known principally for our highly developed industries, mainly textiles. It should not be forgotten, however, that we are also proud to be the home of many outstanding institutions of higher learning, among the greatest of which is Furman. I am pleased to salute Furman University on this significant anniversary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

STEALING AT YALTA

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to title my brief remarks "Stealing at Yalta."

There is an old Biblical passage which says: "Be sure your sins will find you out."

The Washington Post this morning has a most unusual editorial, entitled "Inquest on Yalta." It says, in part:

Another inquest on the monumental blunder at Yalta in February 1945 has yielded from the administration only a reaffirmation of the case for the agreements arrived at there. The agreements handed to Russia port and rail concessions in Manchuria within the sovereignty of China. The American case for the transfer of somebody else's property is based, to quote Secretary Acheson, on "the then military opinion, concurred in by everyone, that the reduction of Japan would have to be brought about by a large-scale landing on the islands of Japan," and, therefore, Russian entry into the Pacific war had to be bought.

The editorial goes on to say:

The fact is, as has been so often stated, that Navy opinion was not concurrent.

It was not in agreement with that position.

Another part of the editorial asks this question:

What was wrong with the Yalta deal?

Then the editorial enumerates two answers to that question. The first is:

That to give away somebody else's property—in this case, the Japanese port and rail concessions in Chinese Manchuria—is just as bad as stealing it oneself. The justification is given that the Russians would have taken the concessions, anyway. This is an excuse

that did not hold water. It is just like saying that if one sees that a man's watch is going to be filched, then it is all right to take it oneself and give it to the thief. Nor is there any justification in the fact—and, despite the Chinese lobby, it is a fact—that the Nationalist Government, so far from resenting the sell-out, welcomed the arrangement—when the Chinese were later told about it—as a stabilizer of its relations with the Soviet Union.

Then this editorial concludes with this sentence:

The administration would be better advised to quit the strained effort to save its predecessor's face, and now that the water is over the dam, to apply the lessons of Yalta in relations with Japan.

On the 14th day of May 1951, I offered House Concurrent Resolution 102, which has as its objective the repudiation of the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial from this morning's Washington Post and also the resolution which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

INQUEST ON YALTA

Another inquest on the monumental blunder of Yalta in February 1945, has yielded from the administration only a reaffirmation of the case for the agreements arrived at there. The agreements handed to Russia port and rail concessions in Manchuria within the sovereignty of China. The American case for the transfer of somebody else's property is based, to quote Secretary Acheson, on "the then military opinion, concurred in by everyone, that the reduction of Japan would have to be brought about by a large-scale landing on the islands of Japan," and, therefore, Russian entry into the Pacific war had to be bought.

The fact is, as has been so often stated, that Navy opinion was not concurrent. On the spot, and in the main here, it was confident that Japan was virtually through at the time of the Yalta conference. Navy men thus were against the post-VE redeployment of our forces in Europe for another amphibious assault in the Pacific. Having Japan in a stranglehold by means of their blockade—a blockade hammered home by fierce and continuous air bombardment—they felt that surrender could be accomplished by attrition, backed by the psychological warfare launched by the Navy's Admiral Zacharias. They had to bow, however, to the Army's estimate of the situation, which, formulated for the preceding Quebec conference, was that Japan could keep on fighting for 18 months after VE-day. It was this estimate and nothing more that induced the men of Yalta to buy a Russian denunciation of the neutrality agreement with Japan and then to become one of the allies against Japan.

What, apart from military misjudgment and the mistake, anyway, of courting Russian intervention in the Far East, was wrong with the Yalta deal? Two things:

1. That to give away somebody else's property—in this case, the Japanese port and rail concessions in Chinese Manchuria—is just as bad as stealing it oneself. The justification is given that the Russians would have taken the concessions, anyway. This is an excuse that doesn't hold water. It is just like saying that if one sees that a man's watch is going to be filched, then it is all right to take it oneself and give it to the thief. Nor is there any justification in the

fact—and, despite the Chinese lobby, it is a fact—that the Nationalist Government, so far from resenting the sell-out, welcomed the arrangement—when the Chinese were later told about it—as a stabilizer of its relations with the Soviet Union.

2. The deal at Yalta killed at birth the only possible foreign policy for postwar America toward Asia. That was to recognize that the age of imperialism was dead, and to lead Asia by peaceful means out of colonialism. The Manchurian concessions—the seedbed of four wars—were Russian spoils obtained from China in the twenties which Japan got by the 1904-5 war with Russia, only to have the British and Americans return them to Russia at Yalta.

No; there is no case for Yalta, and the agreements should have been denounced at the first sign that the Russians weren't living up to them, as, for example, when they impeded free entry into the free port of Dairen. The administration would be better advised to quit the strained effort to save its predecessor's face, and, now that the water is over the dam, to apply the lessons of Yalta in relations with Japan.

House Concurrent Resolution 102

Whereas the private agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Potsdam were based on a complete disregard for the strategic interests of the United States and the free world, and represent a denial of the free and democratic ideals, as expressed in the North Atlantic Charter, which have always been cherished by the American people and for which millions fought World War II; and

Whereas, specifically, the Yalta agreement sanctioned Soviet domination of Eastern Europe and of east Asia, the betrayal of Poland and the mutilation of its natural boundaries, the transfer of the national allegiance of millions of persons without plebiscite or other recognition of their rights to self-determination, and the uprooting of other millions of persons; and

Whereas, specifically, the Potsdam agreement sanctioned the betrayal of China, granting the Soviets a preferred position in Manchuria, the richest and most industrialized area of China, a position which was promptly used as the assembly point and main military base for the Communist conquest of China; and

Whereas the Potsdam agreement, in addition to promising the Soviet Government other vast and invaluable territorial concessions, authorized the dismemberment of Germany and the use of Germans as slave labor by the Soviets, and promised the Soviet Government that the United States would return Soviet political and other refugees for repatriation; that is, for concentration camps or death; and

Whereas the Potsdam agreement provided for the expulsion and transfer of millions of Germans of German ethnic origin from Eastern Europe, Central Europe, and the Balkans to Germany where they have deterred economic and political recovery in Western Germany and have thereby endangered the peace of all Europe; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has consistently disregarded the provisions of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements which it has found inconvenient to honor, including the provision for free and unfettered elections in Poland and the provisions for treating Germany as an economic unit and for encouraging free political parties in Germany; and

Whereas, although the Yalta and Potsdam agreements are the closest approach to a peace settlement for World War II existing today, and although these two agreements, by their inexpedient provisions, have cost the United States untold billions for defense, occupation costs, and foreign economic support, and have led the free world to the brink of another global war, these agreements were

made in secrecy and without congressional participation, approval, or ratification: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the private agreements concluded in 1945 at Yalta and Potsdam should be forthwith repudiated by the United States.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has eloquently pointed out some of our disastrous policy at the time referred to. I wonder if in his study of this question he has also in mind the fact that for several months before the Russians came into Japan the Japanese Government, in several different ways, was trying to get peace discussions started, trying to actually make peace, and whether or not that fact was not known to our State Department?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I understand that it was; as a matter of fact, I understand that peace overtures were made as early as the latter part of 1943.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. One of the efforts was made through the Vatican, and for that reason it was not listened to at all. Does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am not familiar with that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Commissioner FERNÓS-ISERN.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include a resolution from the Chamber of Commerce of Monroe, La.

Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SITTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two editorials and a letter.

Mr. REAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address given at the restored Colonial Capitol at Williamsburg, Va., on May 15, 1917, by Dr. Samuel Eliot Morison, of Harvard University, at the ceremonies marking the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Virginia resolution for American independence.

Mr. DELANEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. James J. Farley.

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. RIVERS) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Mr. Flood at the commencement exercises at King's College.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORRELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech made by him recently in Rhode Island, and also to include a speech delivered by a graduate of St. Xavier's Academy.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) News of the 23d of May on the subject of the voting record of our distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the Honorable HAMILTON JONES.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To MESSRS. GARY, SIKES, COUDERT, COTTON, ROONEY, and WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. CANNON), for the period beginning June 8 to June 20, on account of official business while attending meetings in Europe to study the state of the collective defenses under the North Atlantic Treaty and the economic situation there.

To MESSRS. RICHARDS, GORDON, MANSFIELD, BATTLE, CHIPERFIELD, SMITH of Wisconsin, JUDD, and HERTER (at the request of Mr. RICHARDS), for the period beginning June 8 to June 20, on account of attending meetings in Europe to study the state of the collective defenses under the North Atlantic Treaty and the economic situation there.

To Mr. FUGATE (at the request of Mr. ABBITT), for Thursday and Friday, June 7 and 8, 1951, on account of business.

To Mr. COLE of New York, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHORT, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. REED of Illinois and Mr. GOODWIN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. PRESTON, for an indefinite period, on account of attending UNESCO conference.

To Mr. LIND, for June 11, 12, and 13, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 75. An act authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1. An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of

manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes;

S. 52. An act for the relief of Delfo Giorgi;

S. 53. An act for the relief of Vittorio Quilici;

S. 155. An act for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla;

S. 223. An act for the relief of Azy Ajderian;

S. 276. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander V. Papanicolaou and his wife, Emilia;

S. 277. An act for the relief of Lily Pfannen-schmidt;

S. 291. An act for the relief of Claudio Pier Connelly;

S. 297. An act for the relief of Tsung Hsien Hsu;

S. 348. An act for the relief of Jacoba van Dorp;

S. 356. An act for the relief of Edith Winifred Henderson;

S. 363. An act for the relief of Irmgard Kohler;

S. 463. An act for the relief of Alice de Bony de Lavergne;

S. 548. An act for the relief of Freidoun Jalayer; and

S. 1092. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, June 11, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

505. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to remove certain limitations on number of aircraft, units, and organizations which may be maintained and operated by the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

506. A letter from the Chairman, Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, transmitting a copy of a resolution which was adopted by the legislative assembly, relative to transferring the management and operation of the agricultural experimental stations of the Virgin Islands from the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

507. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a communication from the contestant in the contested election case of Raymond W. Karst versus Thomas B. Curtis for a seat in the Eighty-second Congress from the Twelfth Congressional District of Missouri, and a statement including a motion to dismiss his intention to contest the seat of the returned Member in the said district (H. Doc. No. 160); to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4200. A bill to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept.

No. 542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3716. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands in Pueblo County, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFET:

H. R. 4364. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to the withholding of income tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4365. A bill to prohibit contracts and agreements prescribing minimum prices for the resale of commodities in trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 4366. A bill to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4367. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4368. A bill to enable all Americans to purchase automobiles by eliminating down payments of more than \$1; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 4369. A bill to authorize the sale of a certain site owned by the United States in Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4370. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4371. A bill to permit the postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4372. A bill to provide for the fluorination of the water supply of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4373. A bill to permit the postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4374. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. J. Res. 265. Joint resolution authorizing the commissioner of Public Roads to designate a transcontinental highway system to be known as the Crozet Superhighway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. J. Res. 266. Joint resolution designating the 9th day of June of each year as Clara Barton Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Hungarian people from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human

rights and freedoms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Polish people from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Bulgarian people from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. Res. 248. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation and/or the formulation and execution of foreign policy affecting China and the Far East; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 249. Resolution for the relief of the estate of Ovilla P. Gaucher; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. Res. 250. Resolution to investigate television programing trends and policies with respect to public service and educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to tariffs on wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of August Kiehnlein and Mary Kiehnlein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Stanley Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 4377. A bill to pay an annuity to Richard W. Goodhart; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 4379. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of Paul Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 4381. A bill for the relief of Antonio Parascandolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4382. A bill for the relief of Betty Fah and Lilly Fah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Santiago Juanché-Oroz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 4384. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Needham, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4385. A bill for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

309. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the Central of Polish Organizations of Passaic, N. J., petitioning our Government, through its own leadership and in the name of the United Nations, to prevent the extinction of religious freedom in Poland and other Soviet dominated lands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

310. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution adopted by the United Veterans Council of Rhode Island, petitioning the United States Government, through its Rhode Island Senators and Representatives, to institute a complete investigation of the veterans' housing situation in Rhode Island; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art sifting out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat: Strengthen us, we pray Thee, for the high enterprise of building a more decent world where Thy children may dwell in plenty and fraternity and liberty. In the unknown days of peril and of challenge which loom ahead, give us spirits that are calm and confident, wise and just in the protecting shadow of Thy unfailing love. Though the road to peace in our time be tedious and tollsome, calling for blood and sweat and tears, still lead us on, following the gleam of Thy guidance with clean hands and pure hearts, worthy of the trust the Nation has committed to our hands. We ask it in the name of that One who is our refuge and our strength. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 7, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. CHATHAM, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Mr. VORYS, and Mrs. BOLTON were